Pacific School of
Religion
Berkeley, Calif.

(3)

THE EXPOSITOR

VOL. XXI.

List of Contributors to Volume XXI

Rev. Professor H. T. Andrews, D.D.
Rev. Professor W. Emery Barnes, D.D.
Rev. W. Ernest Beet, M.A., Litt.D.
Professor Vacher Burch.
Rev. Henry J. Cadbury.
Rev. Canon Anthony C. Deane, M.A.
Rev. Alfred Fawkes, M.A.
Rev. Professor G. Buchanan Gray, D.D.
Professor Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D.
The Late Rev. John Hunter, D.D.
Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D.
Rev. Professor H. A. Kent, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Professor Ed. König, D.D.
Rev. J. H. Leckie, D.D.
Rev. Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D.
Rev. Professor A. M. Pope, D.D.
Rev. Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.
Rev. Professor T. H. Robinson, M.A., D.D.
Rev. Professor J. M. Shaw, M.A.
Rev. Edward Shillito, M.A.
Rev. J. F. Springer, D.D.
The Late Rev. Professor Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D.
Rev. Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D., D.Theol.
Rev. Walter R. Whately, M.A.
Rev. G. H. Whitaker, M.A.
Rev. Newport J. D. White, D.D.
Rev. E. W. Winstanley, D.D.
Rev. W. Spicer Wood, M.A.

THE EXPOSITOR

EDITED BY THE REV.

SIR W. ROBERTSON NICOLL,
M.A., D.D., LL.D.

EIGHTH SERIES

Volume XXI

HODDER AND STOUGHTON
WARWICK SQUARE, LONDON, E.C.

MCMXXI

Ser. 8
V. 21
19211

Printed in Great Britain
by Butler & Tanner,
Frome and London

AN OLD TESTAMENT MESSAGE.

Of all prophetic words none are more luminous or incisive than those of Amos: still, after nearly three millennia, they shine and scorch, they smite and sting. We feel them to be hurled across the ages at us and our pagan civilization no less truly than at his own contemporaries, with all the weight of his fierce grim personality behind them; and all the passion of that summons is concentrated in the words, "Prepare to meet thy God, O Israel" (iv. 12). An examination of all that this simple call involves will bring the entire substance of the book and its message before us.

Here plainly three points emerge for consideration: (i.) the character of the *nation* addressed by the prophet—Israel, (ii.) the character of the *God* whom the prophet summons his people to meet, and (iii.) the character of the *preparation* which would be necessary on the part of such a people for meeting such a God.

I. The Nation.

Every line of Amos shows that the prophet was addressing a people very like ourselves, and a civilization, in all essential respects, very like our own. Israel, like ourselves before the war, was a people "at ease" (vi. 1). Nor was that sense of ease without what seemed an adequate foundation in fact: they were at ease, because they believed themselves to be secure and sheltered, "secure in the mountain of Samaria" (vi. 1), sheltered behind or upon those hills

of theirs from the attacks of any probable invaders. In point of fact, when, a generation later, the threatened doom began to knock at Israel's door, the men of Samaria from their mountain city defied the Assyrian army for three whole years, so that their earlier ease and confidence might well seem justified to eyes that were blind to the meaning of moral and historical forces. We, too, like Israel, were at ease—sometimes a thoughtless ease which simply had not considered the peril at all, sometimes an ease which justified itself in its own eyes; for we, too, like Israel, considered ourselves protected, sheltered behind the silver sea, or at any rate behind the ever-increasing multiplicity of battleships that floated upon it, sheltered behind our skilful diplomacy and behind those friendships which a mutually profitable trade and commerce was supposed to guarantee increasingly between the nations.

During this period of ease that rested upon a false security many vices which are never wholly absent from any civilisation had begun to raise on high their ugly heads. (i.) Of these, not the least conspicuous was intemperance—to this Amos recurs again and again—a vice which cursed and crippled ancient Israel nearly as much as it has cursed and crippled modern Britain. He strikes fiercely out at every class, the clergy, the politicians, the women, and with scorn and threat he lashes each in turn. One of the most revolting pictures in prophecy, more dreadful even than that in Isaiah xxviii. 7 f., is the sanctuary scene in ii. 7 f., which reveals, in all its unbelievable nakedness, the depravity of the men charged with the religious fortunes of the people, and the unspeakably vile uses to which the country churches were put by their custodians. These verses give us a glimpse of venal priests, who impose fines either upon deluded worshippers who have come to consult them or upon offenders who may have

been brought before them for some trivial offence, and then with the money thus extorted they procure the wine in which they indulge within the very house of their God. The merry example set by the church leaders was only too gladly followed. The great social and political leaders drank wine by the bowlful (vi. 6). Unhappily the women were as bad as the men. "Cattle" he calls them in his brutally candid way (iv. 1)—like the great sleek cattle that roam the pastures of Bashan, only worse than they: for these women have done what no animal could do—they have made the coarse pleasures of drink the deliberate end of life. And, like the priests who paid for their wine by money unjustly extorted, they paid for theirs by crushing the lives of the poor. These imperious and haughty dames say to their lords, "Bring, and let us drink" (iv. 1), though this can only be done by "oppressing the poor and crushing the needy."

Of course in such a nation as Israel it was impossible that such criminal indulgence, damaging alike to personal character and national security, could pass without challenge. Fierce protests were hurled against it—by Amos himself, for example, as we see: but something in the nature of an organised protest was made by the group of young men known as nazirites. They were the prohibitionists of those days—men dedicated to the cause of Jehovah, and recognising that the real enemy of that cause was no longer, as in Samson's time, the Philistines or any neighbour nation at all, but strong drink. This it was which was fatally deflecting Israel from the simplicity and austerity which had characterised her life and worship in the desert, and this it was which they, by their example of abstinence, set themselves to combat as the supreme foe of their country's weal. Amos regards these young men as gifts of God (ii. 12), comparable to the prophets them-

selves. But how were they treated ? Not only was their protest ignored, but deliberate attempts were made to induce them to break their vow. "I raised up of your young men for nazirites, but ye gave the nazirites wine to drink" (ii. 12).

Does all this not sound strangely modern and singularly applicable to ourselves ? A few months of war did more than all the temperance speeches that had ever been delivered to open the eyes of the country to the menace that lurks in drink. Then, when our very existence as a nation was being threatened, we all saw what a curse and what a peril it is. As fear grew, consciences were stirred and something was done : but even then, in the midst of the greatest war that has ever torn the world, the nation could find it in its heart to spend £259,000,000—and since that time the sum has mounted by more than half as much again—upon the monster that was devouring its food and reducing its efficiency. An indulgence which is so manifestly and confessedly debilitating in time of war is no less reprehensible, because no less debilitating, in time of peace ; only here, as in so much else, war is the great Revealer. But the nazirite protest, which in other lands has been delivered to such purpose that governments have had to listen and legislate in line with it, is gathering in volume here too : and if it should be permanently ignored, the price will have to be paid in the increasing incompetence of the nation to take her place alongside of the soberer, and therefore more efficient, nations of the world—paid, it may even be, in a ruin like that which Amos foresaw and foretold for Israel.

(ii.) A second count in the prophet's indictment is *the love of ease and pleasure*. He says little about impurity, but that little is lurid enough. In a context which discloses priests tippling within the very sanctuaries themselves, he shows us worshippers indulging the vilest passions (ii. 7)

—the one offence, like the other, clothed in the garb of religion. The prophets were not slow to note how intimately immorality and intemperance were associated, and how fatal both alike were to intellect as well as to character. "Immorality and wine," says Hosea (iv. 11) "rob a man of his wits." And this ominous association gives food for thought to those who love their country.

But the amplest picture of the pleasure-loving life is drawn in those verses—among the most vivid in the Old Testament—which describe an ancient Hebrew aristocratic home (vi. 4–6). There we see the leaders of society lazily stretched upon divans inlaid with ivory — clearly they must have been wealthy to have been able to afford such things — and lolling upon luxurious couches. These gorgeous and indolent grandees are gluttons, devouring lambs and calves till none are left in the flock or the stall. But they are not altogether without interest in the æsthetic side of life : they love their vocal and instrumental music, improvising songs to the accompaniment of the viol, and inventing melody of all kinds. It is fitting that amid their music those gluttons should drink wine not from slender cups, but from capacious bowls ; and, like the dandies that they were, they are content with nothing less than the finest oils and perfumes. All this is deplorable enough in men who direct a nation's affairs ; but, with the skill of a true orator, Amos reserves his most damning count to the end : "they are not grieved "—*sick*, the word means —"for the affliction "—literally, *the breach*—"of Joseph," that is, the people. The words imply that the one indispensable quality of a true statesman, or even of a true patriot, is that he be sick at heart, yes, almost literally sick, when he sees his people broken—broken by the ravages of war, or, as they can even more terribly be, by the vices of peace. Upon the statesmen who can look unmoved

upon the havoc wrought, for example, by intemperance, Amos with his terrible "therefore" pronounces the doom of exile and ruin. They and the country they have misguided shall go down together: the great house and the little house alike shall be smashed to atoms: and the noise of the dissolute revellers shall pass into silence for ever (vi. 7–10).

Though these scathing words were levelled at the leaders of Amos's social and political world, it is easy for the sensitive ear to hear in them an arraignment of our whole modern civilisation. No cult has so many devotees as that of pleasure: *panem et circenses*, bread and amusement, still represent the only ambition of millions. They can look round upon all the welter of the world to-day, some were even able to look on at the unutterable tragedy of the war, without a qualm of "sickness." They can engage in the deliberate pursuit of pleasure, with little regard to its moral cost and with practically no regard to intellectual interests of any kind. But the reconstruction for which the world is sadly waiting will never be effected by devotees of pleasure who care nothing for the things of the mind or the spirit.

(iii.) Another startlingly modern feature of the civilisation which Amos indicts is its *dishonesty*. This almost goes without saying. A civilisation whose temper is materialistic can hardly be other than dishonest. Wherever men care more for the things that can be tasted and counted, handled and weighed, than for the things of the spirit, sooner or later they will learn to be unscrupulous in securing them. If money and the things that it can buy are put first, honour will be put second. In the ancient Hebrew world, in the Rome of seven centuries later, in the Europe of two millennia later still, the same gospel has been preached and practised.

O cives, cives, quærenda pecunia primum est,
Virtus post nummos.
Si possis, recte; si non, quocumque modo, rem.

In a few deft strokes Amos brings before our eyes the great grain merchants of those days, and lashes their worldly temper and their shady practices with indignant scorn. They are to him the incarnation of that dishonest and unscrupulous commercialism which exploits a helpless people by making it hard for them to get, at reasonable prices and in reasonable purity, the food they need. They regard the sacred days, the new moon and the Sabbath, as an interruption of their business, and they heave a sigh of relief when those days are over, and the traffic of the market can begin again. "When"—they sigh—"when will the new moon be gone, that we may sell grain, and the Sabbath, that we may set forth wheat?" (viii. 5). And it is no accident that those who rob their God on the Sunday rob their neighbour on the Monday when the market opens. They "deal falsely with tricky balances, making the ephah" with which the grain was weighed "small, and the shekel" with which the purchaser's money was weighed "great." This is just the ancient Hebrew way of saying that they sold underweight and charged extortionate prices. And, as if this villainy were not enough, they did not even give the victim of their cupidity the article he had paid too dearly for, but they must needs adulterate it, selling to him "the *refuse* of the wheat" (viii. 6)—food, in other words, which was not capable of maintaining those who purchased it upon the proper level of vitality. Thus by implication they were murderers as well as thieves. Here surely is the profiteer drawn to the life. The name may be new, but the figure is familiar to every civilisation, especially in times of national distress; and here he is pilloried for all time.

The sin of greed, of grasp—was not that Germany's sin ? But what many of us who justly denounced and attacked her have failed to recognise is that not a few of us are guilty of it too : with this unessential difference, that what she did on a colossal scale and with a magnificent organisation of brains and material equipment, many of us are doing with equal devotion and energy on a smaller scale—on the only scale open to us. What is wrong as between the nations cannot be right as within the nation. Looking to the greed which divides and embitters men, Amos with unerring insight points a lesson to us no less than to his own contemporaries.

> He strikes his finger on the place,
> And says, "Thou ailest here."

(iv.) Lastly, Amos challenges his people with their *indifference to spiritual things*. This again goes without saying. To say that men's hearts are set upon material things is just another way of saying that they have no interest in the spiritual order. But the prophet puts this, as he puts everything else, concretely. He says, " I raised up of your sons for prophets "—men like Amos himself: " but ye commanded the prophets, saying, ' Prophesy not ' " (ii. 11 f.). Amos wrote this out of his own bitter experience : he knew only too well what it was to have his own mouth stopped. In the dramatic scene described in chapter vii. the supercilious priest of Bethel, the Archbishop of his time, sought to stifle officially that brave and honest voice· " Thou visionary, get thee back to Judah : eat thy bread there and play the prophet there, but prophesy not again any more at Bethel " (vii. 12 f.). The call to humiliation and repentance was resented and rejected by Church and people alike.

Here again the analogy with our modern situation is not far to seek. We do not in the twentieth century stop the

mouths of our preachers—we are too civilised for that : we simply do not go to hear them, we evade the challenge by staying away. The empty churches of every denomination tell their own unhappy tale. Doubtless that is not the whole explanation ; but part at least of it lies in the simple fact that many care little for the things for which the Church stands. The spiritual order means nothing to them ; and men who are in that predicament can hardly be expected to ally themselves with an institution, part of whose business is to challenge the lives which they are living and mean to live. They do not say to the prophets, " Prophesy not " ; they say, " Prophesy as much as you please : but I shall take good care to put myself beyond the range of your challenge."

Such, then, was the nation—intemperate, profligate, pleasure-loving and profit-hunting—that Amos summoned to prepare to meet its God, and, count for count, the indictment is as applicable to us as to Israel. Nations which with any justice can be described in such terms have much need to prepare. Of course this description by no means exhausts the character either of Israel or of ourselves. You cannot indict a nation : at any time there are in it all sorts and conditions of men. In Israel there were prophets and nazirites, and no doubt multitudes of good men and women in more humble and inconspicuous walks of life ; and in Britain the sudden demands of war revealed undreamt-of heroisms and found millions of men ready to jeopardise their lives unto the death. That is all true, and for these things we are infinitely grateful ; but the other things are also true, and, if they are true, there is need enough to prepare. Those who interposed so generously in defence of the international order when it was insulted, cannot reasonably resent a call to put the national house in order.

II. God.

(i.) Now what is the character of the God whom Amos summons his people to meet? First of all, He is a God who hates all those things that the prophet has been denouncing. He hates these things, and more, He will not have them. "Shall not the land tremble for this?" (viii. 8). It is very significant that this question comes immediately after Amos's denunciation of profiteering. He means that the land in which such things are done is not a safe place to live in: it is reeling and rocking—or if not now, it will be soon—because it has no solid and stable foundation to rest upon. It will be convulsed, at least by antagonisms and bitter strife, conceivably by revolution. President Wilson has reminded us that the world must be made safe for democracy. That is a noble ideal, but there is a task prior to that. We could contemplate the world-problem with more equanimity if we had mastered the national problem; and the first item on the programme is that each nation be made safe—as Amos knew his own nation was not safe—for the men and women who live within it. Those who would reform the world will be more convincing when they have shown the capacity to reform themselves.

When Amos utters his threat, however, that the land shall be made to tremble because of the sins of the people, he is thinking more particularly of the staggering blow of war. If it seems somewhat external to regard the Assyrians, who were themselves experts in cruelty and rapacity, as divinely summoned to avenge the moral order which had been so wantonly violated by Israel, we have to remember that the prophet regarded war, like every other calamity, as divinely designed to produce at least a more sober, humble, reflective, religious temper in those whom it assailed. "Your young men I slew with the sword"—says

Amos, speaking of Israel's wars with Aram (Syria)—" yet ye did not return unto Me, saith Jehovah " (iv. 10). Amos may have welcomed war, whatever its proximate political source, as the means by which his pleasure-loving people would infallibly be shaken out of their physical and spiritual torpor. At any rate, that is the burden of his threat. " Behold," he says, " I will raise up against you a nation, O house of Israel, saith Jehovah, the God of Hosts : and they shall afflict you " from the one end of the land to the other (vi. 14).

Now a message like that to a people like Israel that fancied itself the elect of God was not only insulting, it was incredible : for the God whom they worshipped was bound, for His own sake no less than for theirs, to see them safely through any disaster which might threaten : if they were defeated or discredited, He would be so too. " You only have I known of all the families of the earth " (iii. 2), which is the Hebrew way of saying that Jehovah cared supremely for Israel as a nation. " Yes," said Amos, " He does : but the true inference from that fact is not what you imagine. He cares for you too much to leave you alone : He will punish you for all your iniquities " (iii. 2). Against the doom threatened by Amos Israel pled privilege ; they fancied that Jehovah could not do without them. The trouble in the ancient and modern world alike has been that the bulk of the people have always worshipped national gods—the ancient world theoretically and practically, the modern world practically, if not theoretically. But the Kingdom of God is not coterminous with any earthly empire. The only God worth worshipping is the international or rather the supra-national God. Amos could be no jingo, nor can any man be, who recognises that there is only one God and that He is the God of us all, that all nations have a place in His thought and purpose, that He

demands a moral service from them all and that all have come short. "*All* we like sheep have gone astray, we have turned *every one* to his own way"; and Amos is angered even more by the sins of his own "elect" people than by the sins of those others who had no prophets and nazirites, at least not such as Israel had, to guide them. History is under the superintendence of one will, the world is a moral unit: and though each nation is called to a service of humanity determined by its special gifts and capacities, God has no favourites. He is no respecter of persons. "Are ye not as the Ethiopians unto Me, O children of Israel, saith Jehovah?" (ix. 7)—no better and no dearer than the swarthy sons of Africa.

The inexorableness of the moral order has never been more grimly portrayed than by Amos. In the course of a passage crowded with terrors he compares the fate of Israel to that of "a man who fled from a lion and a bear met him; or who went into the house and leaned his hand on the wall, and a serpent bit him" (v. 19). The nation that flouts or defies the moral law will be met and overthrown in the end by the subtle, powerful, terrible forces which God has planted in the moral constitution of the world. Almost more dreadful is the picture in ix. 1–4 of the unhappy people who, in their panic to escape the inevitable doom, dig down to Sheol, climb to heaven, hide in the woods of Carmel, cast themselves into the pitiless sea, but all in vain: the arms of God and His law reach to the ends of the world, and from those arms there is no escape. Nations cannot sin with impunity; swiftly or slowly the penalty follows, as the night the day. The gigantic catastrophe which but recently overtook our world is no accident unrelated to the past; as surely as we are living under a system in which effect follows cause, it is the simple result of a gigantic mistake—the mistake on

the part of all the nations, in greater or less degree, of loving and living for the things that are seen more than for the unseen things that are eternal.

(ii.) The God whom Amos summons his people to meet is, as we see, a stern God who is not to be trifled with or mocked. But more, He is a loving God, though it is characteristic of Amos that the word love, which is the key to Hosea's life and message, does not occur in his book at all: because in the existing circumstances that love could only show itself in stern and tragic ways. So God sent disaster after disaster upon Israel, according to Amos, not to get even with His guilty people, nor yet merely to vindicate any abstract moral law, but in order that they might "return to Him." In the artistically constructed poem of iv. 6–12, with its reiterated "Yet have ye not returned unto Me," we get a deep glimpse into the loving heart of God. The famine, the drought, the blight, the mildew, the plague, the war, the earthquake—these stern disciplines were all calls to repentance, calls to return to the God from whom in their social and political life they had strayed so far. These disasters are not here regarded as penalties, but as appeals. They are the very voice of God Himself, summoning a frivolous and thoughtless people to anticipate the day of judgment by preparing in a spirit of humility, soberness, penitence, and awe. It is only after all these calls, which Israel passed unheeded by, that the terrible final call is sounded. "This, then"—pointing darkly to some doom more awful still than any that has gone before—"this is what I will do unto thee, O Israel; therefore prepare to meet thy God."

This interpretation of the purpose and possible issue of disaster in repentance is very suggestive. In a sense somewhat different, yet not altogether remote from that of Amos, we might read these words to our own hearts. "I have given

you cleanness of teeth "—that is, hunger—"in all your cities, and want of bread in all your places: yet have ye not returned unto Me, saith Jehovah." We had some small experience of Amos's meaning in the days when we were rationed and when we stood in queues to purchase our scanty share of some of the necessaries of life: we still know what it is to pay ruefully high prices for our food. In these situations we are reminded by the words of Amos that in the last analysis economic questions are moral and even religious questions. Is it not the literal truth to say that these queues and soaring prices are palpable proof that the nations have wandered away from God and have not yet returned to Him? Were that mind in all men which was in Christ Jesus, were all nations turning in penitence towards God and in friendship towards one another, there would be no war, and no fear, and no scarcity. To turn to God is the beginning of political and economic wisdom.

III. The Preparation.

(i.) What, then, would be the character of the preparation necessary on the part of such a people for meeting such a God? Nothing can have astonished Amos's audience more than to be told that they were not ready to meet Him, for in the direction of formal worship they had prepared themselves abundantly well. They had offered Him a gorgeous ritual service, with burnt-offerings and meal-offerings and peace-offerings of fat beasts (v. 22), and sacrifices of thanksgiving (iv. 5), a service embellished with soul-stirring music of voice and instrument (v. 23). But, according to Amos, that is not the service which God demands at all—never had been and never would be (v. 25). "That is what *you* love," he bluntly says (iv. 5), but it is not what Jehovah loves. Nay, to that sort of service He responds by sending disaster upon disaster (iv. 6 ff.).

Amos speaks almost as if he regarded worship of that sort not only as an irrelevance, but as an organised insult to the God whose supreme interest is character ; that is what *He* loves. In a dreadful antithesis Amos almost seems to deny that God is in the churches at all. " Seek *Me*, but seek not *Bethel* " (v. 4 f.)—as if in all Israel Bethel was the place where He would most assuredly not be found. " Seek Me, and ye shall live, but seek not Bethel," for there is no true life or hope of life there. It is not by ritual and ceremony, Amos is saying, that a frivolous nation can prepare to meet the coming judgment. That is the false preparation

(ii.) What is the true ? It is negative and positive. The people must begin their preparation by abolishing the evils which stain the national honour and cripple national efficiency—the intemperance, the profligacy, the extravagant pursuit of pleasure and profit, and the apathy to the things of the spirit. Government can help in the abolition of some of these evils, but the deepest things no government can do : it can provide the frame-work, it can play upon the outside, but it cannot touch the springs of conduct. Nor need men wait for official action : they can, if they will, abolish those evils within their own individual lives by becoming temperate, pure, honest and serious.

But the positive item in Amos's programme he expresses with a simplicity so superb that its real depth may well escape us. " Seek good, and not evil " (v. 14). That is all, but that is everything : nothing indeed could be more comprehensive. " Seek good and not evil, and *so* "—on those moral terms, and on no other—" shall Jehovah be with you, as ye say." During the war perplexed and broken-hearted people used to ask why God did not intervene. Essentially that was a foolish question, for God is intervening, or rather He is necessarily present, in human affairs all the time—present in virtue of the great moral

laws which move inevitably and inexorably on. The God in whom all things live and move and are could not be other than present in them. The great catastrophe which overtook our world—what was it but grim evidence that God was there, reckoning with nations which, in their life and policies, had not been reckoning with Him? But in so far as there is any sense in the question, may the answer to it not be found in the words of Amos? "Seek good and not evil, and *so* shall Jehovah be with you." In one splendid direction we can honestly claim, as a nation, to have sought good and not evil—in springing, reckless of the cost, to repel a wanton attack upon the principles by which the world is held together. But what of other directions? Can we, whose drink bill is close upon £400,000,000, to say nothing of other sins that darken our national life, look up into the face of God Almighty and say, "O Lord, we have sought good and not evil: we pray Thee therefore to be with us and to bestow upon us Thy grace and favour"? The question answers itself.

But what is the good which we are to seek? Here again Amos's answer is clear as the sun. "Establish *justice*" (v. 15), or, in the immortal words of vi. 24, "Let justice roll on like waters and righteousness as a perennial stream." By justice Amos means fair play as between man and man, a proper and practical appreciation of the rights of each as members of the same commonwealth and sons of the same God. This is the spirit that the prophet desires to see flow through every department of public life, and it is to flow on continuously like the stream that never fails or like the ceaseless moving of the sea, cleansing away all that is foul and bringing beauty and fertility everywhere. And—though this is not at the moment within Amos's thought—this determination to be fair is the secret of international no less than of national weal. It would

deliver men as surely from a policy of vindictiveness in the one sphere as from the practice of exploitation in the other.

(iii.) Objection might be taken to Amos's programme on the ground that he advocates mere morality. Well, even mere morality, if there be such a thing, is not to be despised. A nation which "hated the evil and loved the good" (v. 15), which had delivered itself from intemperance and impurity, from pleasure-hunting and profiteering, would be a wholesomer place to live in than one which has not shaken itself free of these things. But no more than any other Biblical writer does Amos plead for a merely moral solution of our problems. Morality is but the fruit of which religion is the root. In the chapter of disasters to which we have already alluded, each description is closed with the sorrowful refrain, "Yet ye did not return unto ME." And if Amos says, "Seek good, and ye shall live" (v. 14), he also says, "Seek Jehovah, and ye shall live" (v. 6; cf. v. 4). The prophet is not a Bolshevist. He believes in the dictatorship of God, not of the proletariat. His motto is not "Down with the aristocracy, or down with the plutocracy," or down with anybody, it is "Back to God," confess and turn from the sins that are grieving His spirit and ruining the land. This is the way, and the only way, to the permanent material prosperity which would be so welcome to us all—the way of morality inspired by religion, of justice rooted in the fear of God. The earth is the Lord's and the fulness thereof, and out of its super-abundant resources He meant the hearts of all the sons of men to be filled with food and gladness; but this can only be on condition that the first place be given to the interests of His kingdom, which is not co-extensive with any social class or any earthly kingdom, and which is "not eating and drinking, but righteousness and peace and joy in the Holy Spirit." Broadly, that is the burden of Hebrew

prophecy, and our Lord was but summing up the drift of it all when He said, "Seek ye first the kingdom of God and His righteousness; and *all these things* shall be added unto you."

JOHN E. MCFADYEN.

THE NUMBER OF THE BEAST.

"HE that hath understanding, let him reckon up the number of the Beast; for it is the number of man, and his number is six hundred and sixty-six." There is perhaps no passage in Holy Writ about which more nonsense has been written than the above, though there are one or two other passages in the *Apocalypse*, and in the latter part of *Daniel*—the apocalypse of the Old Testament—which enter into some sort of competition with it in this respect. But, the nonsense apart, sane and sober attempts to grapple with its difficulties are by no means lacking, and interpretations have been put forth which give a clear and intelligible meaning to this saying which is admittedly somewhat inscrutable. Possible and plausible as some of the interpretations offered certainly are, there is perhaps not a single one of them which leaves the student convinced that it is a final solution of the problem of this passage, that it has in such wise unravelled the meaning of this cryptic utterance as to silence controversy. As the matter at present stands, in spite of all that has been accomplished, the question as to the precise point upon which the seer had it in mind to enlighten or to warn his original readers is still an open one.

At the very outset I should wish to disavow any claim to have definitely established the true significance of the mystic number, or the three sixes if it is preferred so to describe it. All that is here attempted is the advancement

of a suggestion which may contribute, if only by way of criticism, to that end. It is a suggestion for which I am indebted, in the main, to the conclusions arrived at by previous workers in this field, to whom whatever credit it may deserve must be regarded as largely due. It is also but fair frankly to recognise that the view here propounded is not unencumbered by difficulty, nor is it beyond the reach of criticism—but this is at least equally true of every attempted solution that I have seen. Still, recognising this fact, to claim finality would be absurd, and the interpretation here advocated is proposed in a tentative way with the hope, as already remarked, that it may contribute somewhat to the solution of a most interesting problem. It does, however, appear to me that along some such lines as those here followed the way to a true interpretation of the passage lies—an interpretation at once simple and intelligible, and entirely in harmony with actual fact as revealed in history and experience.

With chapter xii. the second main division of the Apocalypse may be said to begin. The reader is once again confronted with a sevenfold series of judgments. These judgments are no mere repetition of those which have preceded ; for, in the several series of judgments which follow one another, the age-long controversy between righteousness and iniquity is, in each case, contemplated from its own particular standpoint. The Seals series, for instance, as I have already pointed out elsewhere,[1] may perhaps be regarded as shadowing forth certain permanent features of history in which alien forces are continually operating in antagonism to the best interests of humanity, together with an intimation of the means whereby they will be met, and eventually overcome. In the Trumpets series, as the figure of the trumpet inevitably suggests, the element

[1] *The Mystery of the Sealed Book*, Expositor (Aug. 1920), p. 114.

of challenge seems to be the leading feature. For to a very large extent the greater catastrophes which darken human life are in their ultimate origin, either directly or indirectly, the result of sin, positive or negative. Their mere occurrence therefore is a challenge, calling men to think upon their ways, and to rectify that which is amiss in action, or in thought. In the concluding series, that of the Bowls, it is perhaps not far from the truth to see a picture of the Church in conflict with her foes, who are now about to experience the final outpouring of the wrath of God. This conflict is certainly the theme of the opening vision.

Without going into unnecessary detail it may be said in a word that the sun-robed Woman will naturally be interpreted as symbolising the Hebrew religious society, whence Christ sprang according to the flesh, developing into the Christian Church. Against her three formidable enemies are quick to set themselves in array, the Dragon and his attendant acolytes, the two Wild Beasts. It is scarcely open to question that the first-named represents the supreme enemy of mankind, the Devil himself. His grim attendants, however, demand somewhat fuller notice, though it is with the second of the two that we shall find ourselves more particularly concerned.

Accepting the reading ἐστάθη in xii. 18 as distinctly preferable, on intrinsic as well as extrinsic grounds, to the familiar ἐστάθην, the Dragon is depicted by the seer as standing on the sea-shore to summon from beyond the waste of waters the first of his attendant beasts. The character of this Wild Beast from the sea has been so well established that little time need be given to its discussion. The fact that the seer writes from the standpoint of a Hebrew, and cannot have been untouched by the instinctive feelings of the race from whence he sprang, renders it little less than self-evident that this particular enemy is conceived as

coming from without, that he is a foe external to the Church. When one further considers contemporary conditions and circumstances it can hardly be doubted that, so far as the writer and first readers of the Apocalypse were concerned, this enemy was embodied in the administrative system of Imperial Rome. The claims of the Church and the Empire were, in fact, utterly antagonistic, each to the other ; and in Rome and some provincial districts their conflict had already become acute.

Natural as it may have been to a first century writer or reader to do so, we need not, in our interpretation of the symbolic significance of the First Beast, confine our view to Imperial Rome. It will be found at once more satisfying and instructive simply to consider what Rome stood for in the eyes of the second and third generation of Christians, and to generalise that idea. Though in the main just, if a trifle harsh, and in many respects distinctly beneficial to the interests of her subjects, the real basis of Roman authority was force ; Cæsar lorded it over the world by right of the strong arm. In general terms, therefore, we may regard the Beast from the sea as a symbol of material force—sometimes legitimated by the appearance of lawful authority, sometimes, without even the appearance of right, sheer terrorism naked and unashamed—as one of the formidable foes with which the Church would, ever and anon, find herself at issue. In view of the methods all too frequently adopted by this enemy of righteousness to enforce his will, he may perhaps be not inaptly described as the Blackguard Beast.

If this interpretation be correct, few words are needed to make evident that this prophecy has been fulfilled again and again in history and experience. The Blackguard Beast has continuously raged against the interests of the Kingdom of Christ. His activities are, it is true, not so

conspicuous a feature in the religious life of to-day as in the persecuting ages of the past. But one has only to contemplate the awful suffering and unspeakable horror through which the Armenian Church has passed within the last decade, to realise that the Blackguard Beast is still very much alive, ever ready to become, as opportunity serves, the active henchman of the Dragon in his age-long conflict with the Lamb.

So far as outward appearances and first impressions are concerned the second Wild Beast presents a sharp contrast to the first. To the casual observer he presents a generally mild appearance, and does not obviously display the formidable characteristics of his predecessor. His lamb-like appearance is, however, but a disguise, and when he speaks his voice betrays him, for the dragon's hiss gives a clear warning of his sinister character. As in the case of the first Wild Beast, in that of the second also, so far as certain descriptive details are concerned, it cannot fail to be observed by the careful reader that the seer has been, in no small degree, influenced in his symbolic presentation of the truth by the imagery of the visions of Daniel, and re-echoes more than once the Apocalypse of the Old Testament. The points referred to are, however, fully dealt with in commentaries readily available, and need not detain us at present.

It is, however, important for us to bear in mind that the second Wild Beast, as distinguished from the first, rises not from the sea but from the land. It has been already observed that the fact that the first of the Dragon's satellites is sea-born suggests that this enemy is not native to the society assailed, and may be regarded as symbolising external coercion acting and reacting obstructively upon the life of the Church. The second, earth-born Beast will therefore naturally be viewed as arising within the society against which he operates. It is not difficult to

discover in the immediate environment of the first century Asian Churches influences at work which this second Wild Beast would pointedly indicate. But the contemporary interpretation, suggestive though it may be, need not be discussed in the present paper. For the contemporary is, after all, but temporary, one of the numerous transient forms which the same enemy has, from time to time, assumed and laid aside. Our quest is for the universal, for some general principle of iniquity which itself remains unchanged throughout the centuries, while its forms of expression present a long series of changes.

The general idea of the nature of the peril suggested would appear to be that of one arising within the sphere of religion. The lamb like form, which serves to disguise from the casual observer the true nature of the Beast, which is not made manifest until he becomes articulate, would further suggest that this malign thing has, in its first beginnings, an innocent, if not a kindly and beneficent form. If the first Wild Beast, a symbol of material force, be described as the Blackguard Beast, the second may perhaps be designated as the Plausible Beast. It is his function to seduce and to mislead rather than to coerce.

Widely different in character as these two grim foes of the Lamb may, on the face of it, appear to be, they are none the less colleagues in iniquity. For if the Seer's message tells us anything, it is that the second Beast co-operates with the first, and powerfully supplements his work. In this connexion it need hardly be remarked that, again and again, where coercion has failed, seduction has wrought moral and spiritual ruin with a large measure of success. Man may all too often be flattered or talked into a line of conduct or policy into which he could never have been driven.

Passing over the details of the second Wild Beast's

activities as depicted by the seer, which may be readily studied under expert guidance elsewhere, it will suffice for our present purpose to consider the general character of the peril for which he seems to stand. The clue to this may perhaps be found in the mystic number with which this vision concludes.

"His number is six hundred and sixty and six." Upon this apparently inscrutable statement many calculators have busied themselves, with a view to finding an indication, in cryptic form, of some individual whose name it was impolitic or unsafe to indicate directly. In this quest recourse has been had to the Latin, Greek and Hebrew tongues. Of the numerous conjectures which have been hazarded, some are plausible and can hardly be summarily dismissed as impossible, others are fantastic and unlikely to the last degree. But, given time and patience, and due regard to the rules quoted by the late Dr. George Salmon in his *Introduction to the New Testament*, there is hardly any limit to the achievements which may be obtained along these lines. A little diligent experimenting will amply prove the truth of this, and will at the same time afford the experimenter with some innocent amusement. Having had a little personal experience in these calculations I am fain to confess that I have not been convinced by any of the definite solutions which have been offered, though it may be admitted that, if such specific interpretation must be accepted, the mystic number much more probably indicates Nero than either the Papacy or Napoleon—to name but three of the solutions put forward.

Setting aside, therefore, any attempt to read the mystic number as a cryptogram, under which is concealed some individual name, a solution of the riddle must be sought on other lines. The symbolic use of numbers is quite a conspicuous feature in the Apocalypse; dismissing, there-

fore, all thought of numerical values let us seek for a solution by treating the number with which we are concerned in purely symbolic wise, i.e., as representing an idea. For us, then, it will no longer be six hundred and sixty-six, but simply 6, 6, 6, three sixes standing side by side, and by their juxtaposition emphasising the idea or ideas represented by a single 6. Along these lines we may pursue our quest.

Before proceeding there is, however, one important matter to which we must give some consideration. Our findings with reference thereto will no doubt lend themselves to criticism, and will almost certainly fail to commend themselves to some expositors. In no spirit of dogmatism, and fully recognising that I am laying myself open to quite legitimate criticism, I claim no more than to be making an attempt, without any pretence of finality, in the direction of a solution of the problem set by this admittedly difficult passage.

" His number is 6, 6, 6 "—such is the statement of the seer, a statement which, when read in relation to its context, at once raises the question—*whose* number ? Is it that of the first Wild Beast or the second ?—the sea-born or the earth-born ? At the first glance it will no doubt appear to the reader of the five verses, 14–18, that " the Beast " of verse 18, as undoubtedly is the case in the four preceding verses, is the first rather than the second, an impression which is perhaps strengthened by the phrasing of a later passage, xvi. 13. But this is not necessarily the case. Taking the whole paragraph, beginning at the eleventh verse, it will be observed that the term " the Beast " is somewhat loosely applied to both the sea-born and the earth-born monsters without any distinguishing mark. The latter is, however, the principal subject of the paragraph, and there is no inherent improbability in the

view that, in the concluding verse, there is a reversion from the first Beast to the second, and that "the Beast" there is the Beast with whom the paragraph began. If this view be correct, the mystic number refers to the second Beast.

It has been pointed out by previous workers in this field that the number six, as one may infer from the general symbolism of numbers in the Apocalypse, is doubly symbolic, connoting two ideas, and in either case its connotation is sinister. This double connotation is derived from the relation of the number six to the numbers twelve and seven respectively. Both these numbers are to be met with frequently in the Apocalypse, and in probably every case their significance is symbolic rather than numerical.

The number twelve, or its multiples, is of constant recurrence. By way of illustration may be mentioned the throned elders, the host of the sealed, the wreath of the woman clothed with the sun, the gates, foundations, and measurements of the City of God, and the fruits of the Tree of Life. In all these cases, to which the number twelve simply or in multiple form is applied, a link of connexion may be observed; they are one and all associated in some way with the ultimate triumph and security of the people of God, or, in one word, with the general idea of Redemption. Now six is simply twelve broken in half; and if the general idea connoted by the latter is Redemption, when broken it may very fairly be regarded as suggesting unredemption. Thus we arrive at the first general idea for which six seems to stand in the Apocalypse.

Even more conspicuous than the number twelve is the number seven. One need only mention the seven lamps, the seven stars, the seven spirits, the seven seals, the seven trumpets, and the seven bowls. Each of these indicates a group which, in some sort, forms a complete whole, and

is, in spite of an element of multiplicity, in a very real sense a unit. The essential idea which seven seems intended to express when used in symbol is that of completeness, the unity of a complex whole. The number six then stands for incompleteness, yet incompleteness carried to the highest point that it can attain without losing its incompleteness and merging into the complete.

These then appear to be the two ideas suggested by the number six treated as a symbol; and, as already noted above, the 6, 6, 6, the three sixes standing side by side, is set down for the sake of emphasis. It now remains to use these ideas as a clue to the interpretation of the true character of the second Wild Beast, for to him we have assumed that the mystic number is intended to refer.

We have already noticed the reasons for regarding this earth-born Beast as an enemy assailing the Church from within. His first appearance is far from formidable, and his lamb-like form is quite in keeping with the description of his activities which immediately follows. He is pre-eminently a deceiver, and his appeal is, in the first instance, to the credulity of his intended prey. Elsewhere (xvi. 13) he is to be met with under the very suitable designation of the False Prophet. He is first and last and always a Plausible Beast, though in reality a worthy colleague of his grim predecessor, whose aims he has made his own, albeit he seeks to realise them in quite a different way. He, too, like that colleague, must be regarded as standing for something that presents a permanent threat to the best interests of the Church of Christ.

In the absence of any explicit statement as to the precise nature of this subtle peril we shall be well advised to seek for a clue thereto in the mystic number. Our most hopeful starting-point is the doubly symbolic character of the three sixes, which, as previously noted, suggest the general ideas

of unredemption and incompleteness. An additional ray of light may be found in the one explanatory statement with reference to the mystic number which has been vouchsafed to us, the remark to the effect that, whatever else the number may mean, it is "the number of man," i.e. of humanity. If this statement be combined with the first of the suggested ideas, that of unredemption, it leads to the conclusion that in unredeemed human nature the peril inheres. The warning here given, then, in general terms, appears to be that the presence in the Church of those who are formally but not truly of it will be, in every age, a source of danger, not merely to its effectiveness and health, but to its very life. For various reasons, differing in different centuries, such an element has almost always been present in the life and councils of the Church, an evil leaven of worldliness ever unobtrusively threatening to leaven the whole hump. It is not the grossly sinful, of course, who are in question, but those who with a veneer of devoutness and reverence enjoy no vision of anything beyond the horizon of the purely human, and are essentially worldly at heart. Such not only fail of enjoying the vision beautiful themselves, but are a standing menace to the clear perception of it by others with whom they are associated in Church life and work.

So much we may infer from the number six viewed as a broken twelve; we must now consider it as falling just short of seven, nearing completeness or perfection, yet missing it. It is, as we must again remind ourselves, "the number of man." Hence we infer that it is unredeemed humanity at its best, which is not a true best, for it lacks inner renewal, the one thing needful to render it really complete, and to make it perfect in the sight of God. The danger then will appear to be due to the merely human element usurping a place in religious life to which it has no

real claim ; the human at its very best, and in the most attractive form attainable apart from that spiritual experience and inner illumination which is vital to the attainment of perfect humanity as conceived by Jesus Christ. It is not in itself bad as far as it goes, but it does not go far enough, and it is a source of grave peril because men are apt to be blind to that fact. There are many forms of Church activity which may be efficiently carried on by means of this second best, such, for instance, as the departments of social service, administration, and finance. The danger is that an individual serving the Church in some or all of these departments of service may claim, on the strength of his church activities, to be not only a good churchman but a truly religious man, failing the while to realise that he lacks that personal consciousness of Jesus Christ which is indispensable to the attainment of the full stature of perfect manhood as designed by its Maker. Such an one, perhaps unwittingly, imposes on himself a substitute and misses the real, he contents himself with a poor second best without being aware of it, he attains a six, six, six, and fails to see that the seven of Christian completeness has eluded his grasp. If there be, as may well happen, a group of such persons in any particular society they will tend to inflect others with the same spirit, with the result of a general lowering of spiritual love.

It need hardly be pointed out that the administrative and financial business is not infrequently discharged in a spirit which renders this work a means of grace, and brings those engaged in it very near to God. But the fact that it may be done, and efficiently done, by men who are lacking in spiritual vision and experience, may lead to failure on the part of such to realise their need of the saving grace of the Redeemer. The excellence of the work they are doing deludes them into the belief that they are all that they

should be, and that their Christian life leaves nothing to be desired. The lamb-like form of the Plausible Beast disguises from them the fact that they are in the grip of a foe, who by flattery and deception will effectually blind them to their deep spiritual need, and reduce them to that state of self-contentment which is a sure stepping-stone to disaster. How complete and paralysing such disaster may be is illustrated in the picture of the Church in Laodicæa drawn by the hand of the Apocalyptist himself (iii. 14–19). The scene is one of spiritual desolation, existing apparently side by side with efficient organisation and satisfactory finance (cf. iii. 17). What the Blackguard Beast had failed to accomplish in Smyrna (ii. 8–11), the Plausible Beast had effected with terrible success in Laodicæa.

This then, it is ventured to suggest, is the real nature of the foe to the Church symbolised by the earth-born Beast. The mystic number has furnished the clue which has led us to this conclusion. When all thought of numerical value is set aside, and the three sixes are interpreted as representing an idea, the number takes on a meaning sinister enough. The peril is all the greater because it is so subtle, and, quite in keeping with the harmless form under which the Beast which represents it rises from the earth, at its first appearance it has an attractive and even virtuous look. Church activity, work in itself necessary and useful and good, may well seem to afford a splendid sphere for the exercise of spiritual gifts, and in which the religious life may worthily develop. So indeed it may ; but if this round of more or less external duties be conceived of as the beginning and the end of religion, it will become a snare. If such matters, important and necessary in themselves, be permitted to constitute the whole content of any man's religious thought, the real culture of his soul will perish through neglect. In such activity unredeemed humanity

may find the fairest and noblest expression that it can attain to, and very beautiful it sometimes is. That very beauty constitutes its gravest peril. It is not a bad thing, that men should shun it, and it may be so engaged in as to bring rich blessing not only to others but to the doer himself. But, in itself a good thing, if made to serve as a substitute for the best it will become a strong and subtle foe, the Plausible Beast who, while seeming to build up, will actually pull down, and will make havoc of the Church.

W. Ernest Beet.

FELLOWSHIP.

In a collection of Essays called *The Spirit*, edited by Canon Streeter, there is an interesting interpretation (Essay iv.) by Dr. Anderson Scott of "What Happened at Pentecost." It is not what is there said about the Descent of the Holy Ghost that I wish to controvert, but what he regards as "the real primary and enduring result of the Spirit's coming." This, he suggests, was "what was recognised and described as the 'Fellowship' (*ἡ Κοινωνία*)," a condition of things which preceded any effective organisation of a Church.

"Among the many meanings or shades of meaning," he writes, "which may be legitimately assigned to *Koinonia*, it would seem as though the primary and most important one has been seriously overlooked. There is reason to think that in the Acts and Epistles the word not infrequently bears an absolute significance." No doubt it occasionally does, but whether this significance is the one he selects is another question. "The earliest instance of its use is found in connexion with the narrative of Pentecost in Acts ii. 42, as now read by the critical editions: 'They were steadfastly adhering to the teaching of the

Apostles and to the fellowship, to the breaking of bread and (to) the prayers.' " The Received Text reads : "The Apostles' doctrine and fellowship," and I entirely agree with Dr. Scott that this is incorrect, and that "the fellowship" ought to be divorced from "the doctrine," so as not to stand in close connexion with "the Apostles." Where I differ is that "the fellowship" can be rendered "the Fellowship," characterised by "community of Spirit issuing in community of life." In fact, that the Koinonia can here represent an independent entity, having all or nearly all the concrete fulness of a Church. In the remaining items we evidently have the elements of Christian worship, as it was practised in those early days. And it seems quite incredible that one item should start out from the rest and assume to itself the proportions of a Society inclusive of them all. Moreover, in verse 44 (cf. iv. 32), we have the origin of *κοινωνία* clearly set before us : "They had all things common (*κοινά*)." Where *κοινά* gives rise to *ἡ κοινωνία*, and shews that its import is "the going shares," often termed "the community of goods." A reference is made to it in vi. 1, where we are told that "there was a murmuring of the Hellenists against the Hebrews because their widows were being overlooked in the *daily ministration* (cf. 2 Cor. viii. 4)." As beforesaid, the Koinonia represents a component part of the early Christian worship, a worship which nearly, if not entirely, resembles the worship of the present day, with its preaching, offertory, Lord's Supper, and public prayers. The Apostles' teaching is now succeeded by the preaching from the pulpit, the Koinonia, which we may translate as the collection or almsgiving, by the offertory for the poor, the Breaking of Bread, so-called from our Lord's action in order to distribution, is the Lord's Supper or Holy Communion, and the public prayers still form the larger

part of the Service offered. I hold then that Koinonia may be rendered "fellowship" with a little f, but not Fellowship with a great or capital F.

Were this the only place where the term occurs in the sense I have mentioned, this reasoning might very easily be disputed. But it is not so. I have said that Koinonia occasionally has an absolute significance, though not the one assigned it by Dr. Scott. It is used of a collection or contribution [1] in more than one of St. Paul's Epistles. Though even here, where it occurs, its original meaning is probably "fellowship with (*κοινωνία πρός*)," "a going shares with," whence comes "a contribution for *or* towards." Thus Romans xv. 25, 26: "Now I am on my way to Jerusalem to minister to the saints; for Macedonia and Achaia have thought well to make a contribution *or* collection (*κοινωνία*) for the poor saints in Jerusalem." Sometimes this merges in a fuller form. Thus 2 Corinthians viii. 4: "Begging of us . . . the association *or* fellowship in the ministry (*τὴν κοινωνίαν τῆς διακονίας*) for *or* towards the saints." But ix. 13: "Glorifying God for the . . . liberality of your *contribution* towards themselves and towards all." And, probably, Philippians i. 5: "With joy for your *contribution* (*alms*) towards the gospel from the first day until now." So Hebrews xiii. 16: "But doing good and contribution (*κοινωνίας*) forget not." Where sharing of your means with others is intended. Timothy is exhorted, in 1 Timothy vi. 17, to "charge the rich . . . to be ready to impart, prone to share *or* contribute (*κοινωνικούς*)." Again, we find the verb *κοινωνεῖν* similarly employed. Thus Romans xii. 13: "*Going shares in*, i.e. *contributing to*, the necessities of the saints." xv. 27: "If the Gentiles *went shares in* their spiritual things, they ought also to do service to them in their carnal things." Galatians vi. 6: "Let him who is instructed in the Word

[1] The process, not the result, is intended.

go shares with his instructor in all good things." Philippians iv. 15: "When I left Macedonia, no Church *went shares with* or *had fellowship with* me in the matter of giving and receiving save you only." All these examples elucidate the import of the Koinonia in the Acts.

In accordance with his explanation of *κοινωνία*, Dr. Scott interprets Ananias' offence as "treachery to the Koinonia, failing to discern the Body, or to act loyally in accordance with its nature." To pass over the odd allusion to 1 Corinthians xi. 29, and the strange way of taking it, we may observe that the offence is not termed treachery to the Fellowship, but deception of the Holy Spirit, who dwelt in the Christian community, and particularly in the Apostles themselves. It may be called treachery, but what exactly Ananias had done was an attempt to deceive the Christian Church, illuminated as it was by the Holy Spirit. He had not lied to men, but to God, not to mere uninformed humanity, but to humanity led and guided and enlightened by the Divinity now immanent in it.

We see the influence of a prevailing idea shewing itself again and again as we go on. And before proceeding further it may be well to predicate that *κοινωνία* followed by the genitive case, whether in classical or non-classical writers, as a rule means "fellowship, partnership, participation, sharing, association in," the object so presented. This refutes much of Dr. Scott's reasoning from other parts of Scripture. Thus St. Paul does not say to the Corinthians (1 Cor. i. 9) that "it is a *faithful* God who has called them into the Fellowship of Christ, not companionship of Christ, but Fellowship belonging to and named after Him." This would at least have required *εἰς τὴν κοινωνίαν*, not merely *εἰς κοινωνίαν, τοῦ Υἱοῦ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ*. What he does say is: "Faithful is

God, through whom ye were called into association in (to have a share in) His Son Jesus Christ our Lord." Again, in Philippians ii. 1, however eloquent, the words do not ring true : " 'If Christ has any appeal, if love carries any sanction, if the Spirit has really created a Fellowship, if affection and tenderness are its atmosphere,' shew it in word and deed." I do not see where the " sanction " of love comes in, it is " encouragement " or " consolation " in the original. But the main point is the " Fellowship." All that the Apostle says is : " If there is any association in (the) Spirit," if, that is, " you share in the Spirit." And this is confirmed by iii. 10 : " That I may know Him, and the power of His Resurrection, and the association in (*κοινωνίαν*) His sufferings." The thought of a Fellowship created by the Spirit never seems to have occurred to St. Paul.

It is the same in the exquisite Blessing of 2 Corinthians xiii. 13, which is absolutely spoilt by the insertion of a " Fellowship." " Paul," says Dr. Scott, " prays not for the companionship of the Spirit with individual believers, but that the Fellowship which has been created by the Spirit may continue, even as he prays for the continuous manifestation of the grace of the Lord Jesus and of the love of God." He even adds in a note that " there is at least high probability that all three genitives are subjective, and signify respectively the grace, the love, and the fellowship, of which Father, Son, and Spirit are respectively the source." On these lines the salutation in 1 Corinthians xvi. 23, " The grace of our Lord Jesus be with you. My love be with you all in Christ Jesus," might signify : " Grace arising from our Lord Jesus be yours. Love arising from me be yours (too)." But to return, " the Fellowship created by the Spirit " undoubtedly looks like the last resort of a despairing commentator

who is overcome by the feeling that "no exegetical skill can give us certainty as to the meaning of this phrase." Why not? There is no essential difficulty, if we adhere to classical precedent. The sense is, as before, "The fellowship *or* association in the Holy Spirit be with you all." In other words, "May you all have your common share in the Holy Spirit," that sacred Influence which pervades, or should pervade, the entire Body.

"Another name," continues the Essay, "for the Fellowship is the Unity (ἑνότης) of the Spirit" (Eph. iv. 3). Where "Paul traces its existence (that of the Unity) to the work of the Spirit . . . It is the Unity brought about by the faith and knowledge of the Son of God" (verse 13). Now the subjective use of the genitive in both these verses I deny. What the Ephesians are bidden to maintain is "the unity *or* oneness of the Spirit"—His one common presence in them all, which divisions could not fail to destroy. What they are to aspire to is "the unity *or* oneness of faith in and knowledge of the Son of God," that a common faith and knowledge might be the possession of them all. This, of course, makes for ἑνότης not Ἑνότης, and dissolves the identity of Unity and Fellowship.

Again, "the symbol of the Fellowship is the Loaf." "In this symbolism we may find the key to the right interpretation of the difficult passage in 1 Corinthians x. 16: 'The loaf which we break, does it not represent a fellowship of the Body of Christ?' The loaf represents His corporate Body, the Church." There is still something disputable in this statement. That ἐστίν means here and elsewhere not "is," but "represents, stands for, signifies," there can be little doubt. But "a fellowship of the Body of Christ," the Body being employed subjectively, can no more be allowed than "a fellowship of the Blood of Christ," the Blood being employed subjectively. It would be more

correct to say : "The cup of blessing which we bless does it not signify fellowship *or* association *or* participation in the Blood of Christ ? The bread which we break does it not signify fellowship *or* association *or* participation in the Body of Christ ? Because there is one bread (loaf), we the many form one Body ; for we all partake of the one bread." In other words, the bread which is broken for distribution signifies for those who eat of it partnership in the Body of Christ, the cup which is blest and then distributed signifies for those who drink of it partnership in the Blood of Christ. Their's is Christ's flesh, His blood flows in their veins ; they constitute His living Body mystical. Because the bread is one, though in many portions, the Body, though formed of many persons (members), is one, for all partake of that one and the same bread.

Once more, "the Fellowship is the organ of Insight." "In writing to Philemon St. Paul prays (verse 6) that 'your faith-fellowship (the fellowship founded on your faith) may be effective unto the recognition of every good thing that is ours in Christ.' That is to say, the Fellowship is to have its proper and expected result in the progressive discovery of spiritual truth." A want of estimation of the exact value of the prepositions is visible here. It would be better to say that St. Paul prays that Philemon's "faith-fellowship (*sic*) may turn out effective *or* productive, through knowledge of every good thing that is amongst us, in regard to *or* in the cause of Christ." "In Christ" would be ἐν Χριστῷ, not εἰς Χριστόν. But "the fellowship founded on your faith" will not do at all. What is really said is "thy fellowship *or* association in the faith (*or* 'in faith')." And the Apostle's prayer is that this may turn out productive in relation to Christ, that is, in advancing His Kingdom. For is not Philemon (verse 1) St. Paul's "fellow-helper," doubtless in the Gospel ?

Even the statement that "Love, which is the atmosphere of the Fellowship, is the condition, the stimulating influence of spiritual knowledge," as inferred from passages like Philemon i. 9, Ephesians iii. 18, Colossians ii. 2, does not appear to me quite to hit the mark. Love, undoubtedly, may well be called the atmosphere of Christian fellowship, but the passages adduced rather imply that love and spiritual knowledge are two distinct Christian virtues, than that one is derived from the other. In Ephesians iii. 18, the portion of "love" seems confined in its effect to union "with all saints," and not in what follows to govern the actual apprehension of the magnitude of Christ. In Philippians i. 9, if, as is likely, the proposition ἐν means "together with," or "through," and not "in," spiritual knowledge is rather the accompaniment or the basis of love than love of it. In Colossians ii. 2, the two are set side by side, but without any close connexion between them. But the question requires more elaborate attention than can be bestowed upon it here, and does not materially affect the impropriety of drawing everything within the bounds of a concrete and so-named Fellowship, which no doubt exists, but only manifests itself implicitly and relatively as a quiet if constant undercurrent in the records of the time.

And so we need not delay on the assertion that "these manifestations of life . . . could be described indifferently as taking place 'in Christ,' 'in (? 'through') the Spirit,' and 'in' or 'through the Fellowship.' These three conceptions mutually support and explain one another. They are really different ways of contemplating the sphere of Christian experience." Only change "the Fellowship" into "the Church," and we are at last in virtual agreement. But none the less is there a call for greater exactitude in exegesis, nor can it be allowed for a moment that Koinonia

stands anywhere for a visible Fellowship of believers, although in a minor sense it signifies fellowship or association on their part in things that belong to their common peace.

It is most necessary to insist on this fact the more strongly that "fellowship" and not "Fellowship" is the import of *κοινωνία*, because it is becoming a fashion of the times [1] to speak of "the Fellowship" as though it were one of the scriptural terms in use for the Christian Society or Community. This appellation is nowhere to be found in Scripture, the nearest approach being "the Brotherhood *or* Fraternity (*ἀδελφότης*)," as employed in 1 Peter ii. 17, v. 9 ("Love the Brotherhood"). Of course, as we have already seen, "fellowship" is common enough. Some other characteristic examples of its use are 2 Corinthians vi. 14, 1 John i. 3, 6, 7.

It may, perhaps, be demanded of me to state what, if not "the Fellowship," *was* "the real, primary, and enduring result of the Spirit's coming." The primary result was, in accordance with our Lord's own promise, a power, such as the Apostles had never possessed before, to bear witness everywhere (Acts i. 8) to Jesus and His Resurrection, and (John xvi. 8-11) to convict the world in the matter of sin and of righteousness and of judgment. And with this power went, as we should say in the Army, an augmented *moral*, a courage which nothing daunted to speak the word with boldness, and a capacity of confirming the word preached by evidential signs and wonders. This was the primary result. But the consequent and enduring result was the establishment of a Christian Church, which, if the Church is the Body of the Baptized, may be said to

[1] For instance, the Bishop of Peterborough uses the expression in his Pastoral Letter in the Peterborough Diocesan Magazine for November, 1920.

have virtually commenced on that day of Pentecost when 3,000 were baptized, and the essentials of a new Christian worship, having links with the Jewish worship which preceded it, were instituted. These were the beginnings, but that the Church was intended to be no longer local and national, like the Jewish, but catholic and universal, we know from our Lord's marching orders to His disciples (Matt. xxviii. 19, Mark xvi. 15, Acts i. 8), and from the later Mission to the Gentiles, as carried out by St. Paul and others. So that the Church (not "the Fellowship") fitly framed and founded, and already shewing signs of organisation to be completed as time went on and need arose, may be said to be the real, and, if not primary, enduring result of the Descent of the Holy Ghost.

The first Whitsunday was the Birthday of the Christian Church.

WILLIAM SPICER WOOD.

"SEE THOU TELL NO MAN."

WHY did our Lord forbid the publication of certain of His miracles? Perhaps no complete answer to this question is possible; but there seems still to be room for a more thorough discussion of the problem, and even for a fuller and more satisfactory statement of its data, than the present writer has seen. Some passages which might help to a solution are commonly ignored, while others are adduced which do not seem to have any real bearing on the question.

We must begin, obviously, by ascertaining what the data actually are.

1. These prohibitions are confined to one class of our Lord's miracles, those performed upon the body of man. Bishop Westcott seems to be right [1] in grouping together

[1] *The Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles.*

under this head the miracles of healing and of resuscitation,[1] and in distinguishing these sharply, not only from the Nature miracles, but from the exorcisms. To this class, then, the prohibitions are confined. The Nature miracles were performed for the most part for and among the disciples only.[2] They were the most secret of all His miracles, and we may perhaps suppose that the disciples were under a general injunction not to speak of them. This supposition receives some support, as we shall see later, from the healing of Peter's mother-in-law.

It is equally noteworthy—and to this point also we shall return later—that our Lord never forbade His exorcisms to be made known. As this is not universally admitted, a word of proof must be added. Dr. Sanday[3] alleges Mark i. 34, and also iii. 12, with which latter verse he compares Matthew xii. 16, as instances in which, "after a miracle has been performed, the recipient is strictly cautioned to maintain silence about it." This is surely erroneous as far as Mark i. 34 is concerned. Nothing whatever is there said to the recipients. The command, we are expressly told, is addressed to the demons themselves, and is exactly similar to that in verse 25, "Hold thy peace, and come out of him." The reason for this is obvious. Had Jesus connived, even by silence, at the proclamation of His Messiahship by evil spirits, He would have afforded some slight excuse to those who charged Him of complicity with Beelzebub. Bengel's comment is right, *Neque hoc tempus erat, neque hi praecones.* In four cases of exorcism no such command is given, but in three of these we are

[1] Hort points out (*The Way, the Truth and the Life*, p. 103) that our Lord spoke of Himself as saving life when He healed the man with the withered hand.

[2] The only exceptions seem to be the Feeding of the Five Thousand, and (presumably) the Feeding of the Four Thousand.

[3] *Hastings' D.B.*, Art. "Jesus Christ."

expressly told that the devil was dumb, and in the fourth —the case of the Gadarene demoniac—there is no indication of any spectators other than the twelve.

And is not this the right explanation of Mark iii. 12 also? The phrase there used appears to have the same meaning as that used in Mark i. 34; what our Lord enjoined was, "that they should not make him known.[1] The parallel in Matthew xii. 16 demands, however, separate treatment. Our Lord's words are similarly reported, but as Matthew does not actually mention demoniacs—he only says, "great multitudes followed him, and he healed them all"—it would seem that he attached a different meaning to the prohibition. What was that meaning?

This ought not to be very difficult to discover, since the Evangelist himself appends a quotation from Isaiah with the express purpose of giving us the clue. The only commentator, so far as the present writer has noticed, who has made much use of the hint is Zahn. He points out that Jesus had retired from the Holy Land after a controversy with the Pharisees which had resulted in their conspiring with the Herodians to destroy Him. His mission, even in Galilee, was not yet finished, and He accordingly took measures to avoid a premature rupture with the authorities. He could easily have protected Himself against them by throwing Himself upon the enthusiasm of the multitudes, and thus forming a party which neither Pharisee nor Herodian, nor both combined, would have cared to face. But His character and His commission alike forbade this expedient. The Servant of the Lord was not to "strive nor cry," neither should "any man hear his voice in the streets." The time was to come when He would steadfastly set His face to go to

[1] The phrase itself does not seem very naturally to bear the meaning which Dr. Sanday puts on it.

Jerusalem, but in the meantime He quietly avoided both needless danger and needless strife. That this, and not the reference to Messiah's mission to the Gentiles, is the main point of the quotation, seems clear from the fact that Matthew—unlike Mark—does not mention the presence of Gentiles in the multitude. The natural inference surely is that our Lord did not wish His place of retirement to be known more widely than was inevitable. It could not, of course, be wholly concealed, but if, as seems probable, He was moving about from place to place, even a few hours' delay in the spread of such information might serve His purpose.

This explanation of Matthew xii. 16 seems to be confirmed by Mark vii. 24, where Jesus once again, after a controversy with the Pharisees, withdraws from the borders of the Holy Land. On this occasion we are expressly told that He sought secrecy—"He entered into an house, and would have no man know it."

There is, then, no evidence that Jesus ever attempted to keep His exorcisms secret. The reason for this we shall discuss later.

2. The second *datum* is that, as far as the narratives give us clear guidance, no publicly performed miracle seems to have been followed by an injunction of silence.[1] This is what we should naturally expect; and on this ground also Dr. Sanday's explanation of Mark i. 34 and iii. 12 is surely improbable.

3. Thirdly, *all* privately performed miracles (of this type) were—so far as we can judge from the narratives—ordered to be kept secret, with the exception of the healing of Simon's wife's mother. This exception seems to confirm

[1] The healing of the leper in Mark i. 40-45 does not seem to be an exception to this, though Matthew's narrative, if it stood alone, might suggest publicity.

the suggestion already made that the disciples were under a general injunction not to divulge private miracles. The case of the Transfiguration was peculiar. It was not exactly what we call a miracle, and it bore so directly upon the question of the Messiahship of Jesus that the temptation to publish it must have been very strong. It may be also that Jesus did not want all the Twelve to know of it.

4. Fourthly, in four out of the five cases Jesus Himself took means to ensure privacy. He did so at Capernaum, where He took no notice of the blind men till they had followed Him into the house; He did so in the house of Jaïrus; He did so when He led the deaf and dumb man out of Bethsaïda, and forbade him to return thither. It is noteworthy that these precautions were taken after the first of the five prohibitions had been disobeyed.

5. And this last point leads up to the fact that the prohibitions tend to increase in urgency. From the first, indeed, they were strict and peremptory; "he straitly charged him . . . See thou say nothing to any man" (Mark i. 43, 44); and similar language is reported in Mark v. 43 and Matthew ix. 30. But in Mark vii. 36 the injunction was given again and again, and in Mark viii. 26, though we must abandon the received reading, "nor tell it to any man in the town," the prohibition even to enter Bethsaïda is more significant than any mere injunction of silence could have been.[1]

6. The next fact is that the prohibitions were confined to Galilee and its immediate neighbourhood.[2] No instance is supplied by the miracles performed in Peraea,[3] at Jericho,

[1] The οὐδέ is emphatic and eloquent. It introduces a sort of *a fortiori*.

[2] The instance recorded in Mark vii. 31-37 must not be taken as performed in heathen territory. Dr. Swete remarks in his Commentary (v. note *in loc.*), "The Lord is again in the land of Israel."

[3] That is, during what is called the Peraean ministry; we have no exact geographical information here.

and in Jerusalem. Especially striking is the contrast between the healing of the blind men at Capernaum, and the healing of Bartimaeus at Jericho. In the latter case Jesus responds publicly to the cry, "Have mercy upon us, thou Son of David"; in the former, as we have seen, He does not. To this point we shall return later. There is a similar, if less striking contrast between the cleansing of the leper in Mark i., and the cleansing of the ten lepers in Luke xvii.[1] Here the Samaritan publicly advertises his cure, and Jesus plainly hints that the others ought to have done the same.

Another touch of contrast is added by St. John's account of the ministry in Jerusalem. Both in Jerusalem and elsewhere Jesus healed people on the Sabbath Day. But in Galilee and on the last southward journey there seems to have been always a special reason for this. He was expressly asked to heal Peter's mother-in-law; and, moreover, that miracle was performed in private. In the case of the man with a withered hand, He was challenged on a point of principle, and could not but accept the challenge. Matthew alone puts the challenge into words, but it is clear even from Mark and Luke that Jesus was conscious of it. The same remark applies to the case of the dropsical man (Luke xiv. 1–6) and possibly also to that of the woman with a spirit of infirmity (Luke xiii. 11–17). In these two last instances, moreover, it is quite likely that Jesus might never have met the sufferers again. But in the two healing miracles performed at Jerusalem, He seems to have deliberately selected the Sabbath Day for the cure. He was residing in or near Jerusalem, where the sufferers lived; the cases were both chronic, and could well have waited a day or two for their healing.

[1] v. 12 suggests that the incident probably took place in the village street.

In these cases, then, the Lord seems to have courted publicity and discussion.

And the same may be said of the raising of Lazarus. The mere healing of his sickness would not (as the remarks of the Jews in John xi. 37 indicate) make any very special impression on those who knew that He had healed the man born blind, but the Lord's own words in verse 4 (notably similar to His statement about the blind man in ix. 3) suggest that the resuscitation of Lazarus was designed to make a more powerful appeal.

7. The seventh and last *datum* is found in Mark i. 45, where the Evangelist tells us the result which followed from the leper's disobedience to our Lord's command; "Jesus could no more openly enter into the city, but was without in desert places: and they came to him from every quarter."

These, then, are the facts. How are they to be interpreted? It will be simplest to begin with 7, in which the Evangelist himself gives us the germ of an explanation, by telling us how our Lord's movements were restricted by the leper's disobedience. This is a pregnant hint, the only one of its kind which the Gospels contain, and we shall do well to follow it.

It enables us, in the first place, to dispose of two interpretations which have been suggested, of the first as untenable, and of the second as at least inadequate.

It is surely odd that anyone should ever have suggested that the prohibitions were not very seriously meant, and that Jesus regarded the loquacity which could not or would not be thus restrained, with a sort of amused tolerance. Not to dwell on the fact that the suggestion—though certainly not so meant[1]—has an air of flippancy about it,

[1] I cannot recall where I have seen this suggestion; but its author was certainly a well-known orthodox theologian.

it cannot possibly be reconciled with Mark i. 45, or with the urgency of the prohibitions or the pains that Jesus took on certain occasions to ensure privacy.

The second interpretation, that it was for the restored sufferer's own sake that silence was imposed, lest the spiritual impression which the miracle was intended to produce should evaporate in talk, may possibly be correct as far as it goes, but, like the former, it leaves Mark i. 45 unexplained.

It is obvious at the very outset of the inquiry—and so much may be conceded to the second of the foregoing explanations—that Jesus could not, in any of the cases, have hoped to secure absolute secrecy. What He evidently did desire was to restrict as far as possible the publication of His miracles of healing and resuscitation, and by such restriction to limit the size of the crowds that thronged Him. So much is plain from Mark i. 45, where it is unmistakably implied, first, that the leper's disobedience had the effect of greatly increasing the crowds, and secondly that this increase prevented our Lord from continuing His work openly in the towns.

But we have still to ask the crucial question, Why did the pressure of the crowds interfere with His work? We know that He had compassion on the multitudes; we know that He desired that as many as possible should hear the message of the Kingdom. Neither as prophet, therefore, nor as healer, should we have expected *a priori* that He would desire in any way to limit the size of the crowds that gathered round Him. (It may be remarked, in passing, that if the gospel story had been legend, not history, no such problem would have confronted us.)

And yet the reason is perhaps not very far to seek. It will be remembered that the injunctions of silence belong exclusively to the Northern ministry. Now the religious

atmosphere of the North was not quite the same as that of Judaea. In Judaea, and particularly in Jerusalem, under the very eyes of the religious and political leaders, it was impossible that His ministry could take the same course that it did in Galilee. In the first place, the Messianic hope was less ardent in the South,[1] and the claims of Jesus, even as the Galilean populace understood them, would have aroused less enthusiasm there than in the North. In the second place, those claims must have been better understood in the religious capital than in Galilee. Questions must have been asked, and answers must have been given which would have laid bare, at least in some measure, the deeper implications of Christ's teaching about His Person and authority. (This, of course, is exactly what the Fourth Gospel tells us did happen.) The religious leaders, therefore, must have either accepted or rejected Him on His own terms; and it was precisely on His own terms, as even the Synoptists tell us, that they rejected Him. He was condemned for blasphemy. Nor is this the only confirmation which the Synoptic Gospels give us of the picture presented in the Fourth Gospel. It appears from Mark iii. 22 that the bitterest personal opposition even in Galilee emanated from "the scribes which came down from Jerusalem," and Luke v. 17 suggests that the same malign influence was present there at an even earlier date. St. John is therefore not alone in giving us to understand that the rejection of Jesus by the religious authorities in Judaea and Jerusalem was, on the whole, open-eyed and emphatic from the first.[2] Once again, it is not John but Luke (xiii. 23) who reports the saying,

[1] Presumably the chilling influence of the chief priests, who were mostly Sadducees, had something to do with the state of feeling in Judaea.

[2] This statement does not exclude the recognition of the fluctuations of feeling and opinion recorded in the Fourth Gospel.

"It cannot be that a prophet perish out of Jerusalem."

The situation in Galilee was different. The danger there, where Messianic hopes burned high, was of an unspiritual acceptance of Jesus as a Messiah corresponding to popular expectations, a supernatural Son of David, mighty in word and deed, at once prophet and miracle-worker, who should "restore again the kingdom to Israel." With the exception of this last item, this conception was a true one as far as it went, but it not only did not include, it actually, as they held it, obscured the deeper significance of His Person and work. There was no room here for the Suffering Servant of Isaiah liii., no room for the universalism which was always at least latent in our Lord's teachings, no room even for the unworldly ethics of the Sermon on the Mount. And just here we touch another significant fact already noted, that the injunctions of silence were confined to the type of miracle which we have indicated. The exorcisms were never so treated by Jesus [1]; in the miracles on man's body the prohibitions occur in five out of fifteen or sixteen instances, while the Nature miracles were performed almost exclusively in the privacy of the inner circle of disciples. Least of all did our Lord wish to call special attention to these last; they were at once the most startling and the least obviously ethical of His mighty works; and when He did at last perform one in public, the carnal enthusiasm of the Galilean multitudes reached its climax, and they endeavoured to take Him by force and make Him a king. That incident appears virtually to have brought the Galilean ministry to an end. Secrecy and retirement from thenceforth increasingly mark its course, and before long the Lord makes His final departure from Galilee.

The conclusions thus reached seem to be strikingly

[1] For the reason of this *v. infra.*

borne out by a consideration of our Lord's attitude towards those who addressed Him as "Son of David."[1] This, of all our Lord's titles, was perhaps the one which lent itself most readily to the worldly and political conception of Messiah which the Galilean multitudes were so eager to apply to Him. The title was His, of course, by right; He could not disclaim it; but He did not wish to use it where it was so likely to be misunderstood, and where misunderstanding must produce such disastrous results. In the North, therefore, He declined to respond to it in public. He took no notice of the blind men at Capernaum while they called after Him by that name *in the street*; it was not till they had followed Him into the house that He healed them. He seems to have treated the Syrophœnician woman in the same manner; Matthew's narrative shows that the incident took place, or at least began, in the open air,[2] and the fact that Jesus did not at first rebuff, but *ignore* her altogether, suggests an unwillingness to respond to a loud and public appeal to Him as "Son of David."

How different all this is to His attitude to blind Bartimaeus, and to His acceptance of the royal title on His triumphant entry into Jerusalem! Nor can the difference be wholly explained by saying that Jesus became less reticent towards the end of His ministry. We have seen that the close of the ministry in Galilee was marked by increasing reticence and privacy; the chief determining factor seems to have been place and environment. And we have seen that this was just what we should naturally expect under the different conditions which prevailed in the two districts.

But there is more evidence still to be adduced. The *a priori* argument that the title "Son of David" was specially liable to misconception by the people is con-

[1] I have anticipated some part of this argument in the *Churchman* (Feb. and March, 1919).

[2] "She crieth after us"—"then came she" (Matt. xv. 23, 25).

firmed, as we have seen, by our Lord's attitude to it; we shall now see that it is confirmed by the attitude of the people themselves. No one, so far as we are informed, prior to the Triumphal Entry, ever addressed or spoke of Jesus in this manner, except in connexion with a miracle hoped for or performed. Three times He was thus appealed to by those who desired such help from Him; and once the casting out of a demon evoked the question, "Is not this the Son of David?" Even at His Triumphal Entry, which seems to have followed immediately upon the healing of Bartimaeus, it is quite possible that the crowd may have caught up the words which had met with such a gracious response in the streets of Jericho;[1] and the children who raised the same cry in the temple were apparently moved to do so by the sight of "the wonderful things that He did."[2] We must not read too much approval into our Lord's comments upon these two incidents. He accepted the homage, for shallow and inadequate as it was, it was sincere, and it was His due,[3] and it was evoked at least in the former case by His own deliberate fulfilment of Zechariah's prophecy. It would have been monstrous had no voice been raised in sympathetic response to that claim; Nature herself would have abhorred such a vacuum, and the stones would immediately have cried out. The enthusiasm of the crowd was doubtless as crude as that of the children, and less pure, but the Lord would not permit any criticism of either by the Pharisees, who grudged Him even that imperfect homage.

[1] St. Luke, indeed, tells us expressly (xix. 37) that the enthusiasm of the multitudes was evoked by "all the mighty works which they had seen."

[2] Matt. xxi. 14, 15. They had presumably caught up the actual words from the crowd that accompanied the Lord into Jerusalem.

[3] And, as His due, it must be claimed publicly; the cup of the nation's guilt was not full till it had heard and rejected *all* His claims; and for making this claim the time was now ripe and the place appropriate (*v. infr.*).

It may be objected that the scene at the Triumphal Entry shows that the error which prevailed in Galilee existed in Judaea also.[1] Doubtless it did, to some extent. But its focus seems always to have been Galilee ; the rising which had been imminent in the North (John vi. 15) could hardly have been contrived, even by Galileans, at Jerusalem ; and the Galilean enthusiasm was now wearing very thin. The acclamations at the Triumphal Entry were but the last flicker of a dying flame ; and the same crowd which on Palm Sunday had cried "Hosanna," on Good Friday were shouting, "Crucify Him."[2]

Two facts, we may observe in passing, seem to emerge as one studies these phenomena, first, that they exhibit a close and subtle consistency, alien alike from accident and design, in the Synoptic narratives,[3] and second, that they supply from those narratives a view of our Lord's ministry harmonious, so far as it goes, with that of St. John.

One further point remains to be noted. The conclusions thus reached are confirmed by a study of the exorcisms. The Nature miracles were usually performed in private, the miracles of healing and resuscitation with such small measure of privacy as circumstances allowed ; but there was no privacy in the exorcisms. These were pre-eminently moral and spiritual miracles,[4] direct attacks upon the kingdom of darkness, deliverances of soul as well as body, and therefore miracles which showed more fully than any others could the true nature of Christ's Kingdom, and the true character of the King. They showed not only His love and power, but His holiness, the absolute antagonism between His Kingdom and the kingdom of spiritual evil

[1] As a matter of fact, the crowd was probably in large measure Galilean.

[2] Note the unanimity indicated in Matt. xxvii. 22, "They all say unto him, Let him be crucified."

[3] They are found in at least three of the recognised sources.

[4] Westcott, *Characteristics of the Gospel Miracles*, Sermon III.

that He had come to destroy. And it was the full and overwhelming revelation thus made which revealed also the depth of wickedness underlying the opposition of those who accused Him of complicity with Satan, and evoked the warning recorded in Mark iii. 28, 29.[1] Westcott has shown in detail[2] the moral and spiritual effects which these miracles were calculated to produce, both in the disciples and in the mutlitudes. On the disciples these lessons were doubtless not wholly lost.[3] But the multitude seem to have viewed them chiefly as displays of extraordinary power,[4] and to have linked them on to their own conception of the Son of David (Matt. xii. 23). No greater proof, perhaps, could have been given of the blindness which had fallen upon Israel, than that even these miracles could not make them see the true character and mission of Him who had come to save His people from their *sins*. The scribes from Jerusalem did see this; they perceived His holiness, and hated it; their's was the clearer vision and the deeper guilt; but the blinded multitudes of Galilee did not even see it.

Finally, we note that while Jesus never forbade the publication of an exorcism, in one case He actually commanded it, an incident quite unique in His ministry. "See thou tell no man"—the prohibition imposed upon the Galilean leper—stands in striking contrast to the injunction given to the Gadarene demoniac, "Go home to thy friends, and tell them how great things the Lord hath done for thee, and hath had compassion on thee"; but if the view advocated in these pages is correct, the two commands were dictated by the same motive.

WALTER R. WHATELY.

[1] And also, of course, in Matt. and Luke.

[2] Westcott, *op. cit.*, Serm. III.

[3] Note their question in Mark ix. 28.

[4] Even the Seventy seem to have viewed them too much in this light; note Luke x. 17, and the Lord's answer in *v.* 20.

JOHN MacLEOD CAMPBELL:

The Development of His Thought.[1]

I.

Dr. Döllinger, writing in the fifth decade of the nineteenth century, complained that, excepting the works of the "Aberdeen Doctors," the Scottish Church had made no important contribution to scientific theology. This deplorable sterility he attributed to the dominance of the Calvinistic system which had, within the religious sphere, been able to paralyse the metaphysical power of a very gifted people. Nor can we affirm that the illustrious Catholic scholar was mistaken. In the year 1850, it was perfectly fair to say that the countrymen of Hume had failed to produce theological fruits worthy of their reputation. It is true, also, that the national genius did not assert itself in the world of religious speculation until the Genevan orthodoxy had begun to lose its power. We find a striking vindication of Döllinger's pronouncement in the circumstance that, when he wrote, John MacLeod Campbell was already maturing those thoughts which were formulated a few years later in his book on the Atonement. That book is the masterpiece of Scottish theology; and its author had been deposed from the ministry in 1831 for his departure from the Calvinistic tradition.

[1] Sources:

Memorials of John MacLeod Campbell. (Very important.)

Whole Proceedings in Case of John MacLeod Campbell (an indispensable authority.)

Reminiscences, etc., by John MacLeod Campbell, D.D. (Recollections written in C.'s old age, and modified by his later thought.)

The Row Heresy. (Papers concerning the Row Case, with 19 sermons by C., printed from shorthand notes. Valuable.)

Responsibility for Gift of Eternal Life. (Posthumous vol. of early sermons, "greatly changed from their original form.")

Christ the Bread of Life. (C. on Eucharist. Not important.)

MacLeod Campbell was the first clergyman of the modern Scottish Church to suffer ecclesiastical martyrdom in the cause of religious liberalism. Those who had experienced a like fate in an earlier generation, as for instance the Erskines, had been, for the most part, extreme theological conservatives. But the condemnation of Campbell was the opening episode in a war for greater freedom of teaching which went on for more than fifty years and had, for its most famous battle, the trial of William Robertson Smith.

But, if the Row " Heresy Case " was thus the beginning of a long conflict, the chief figure in it was not a typical insurgent. There were many things in his character and training which predisposed him to conformity. He was of purely Highland blood; and the Highland genius, blended of mysticism and logic, has never been prone to formal heresy. He was a minister's son; and ministers' sons are rarely revolutionaries. Moreover, he experienced nothing in his youth such as sometimes produces revolt and recoil: no severity, no hardness, no repression. His father, Dr. Campbell of Kilninver, belonged to the Moderate party in the Church, and was of liberal opinions in theology, though he was a man of warm piety and evangelical spirit. Family life in the Manse was cheerful and affectionate, altogether free from that austerity which seems to have prevailed in some clerical households of that period. We read of evenings spent in music and dancing, and of pleasant social intercourse with Mrs. Campbell's people the MacLeods, and with other friends in the surrounding district. The whole atmosphere of the home was fitted to nourish an unaggressive reasonable spirit; religious but tolerant, scholarly but humane. A strong influence, also, in the education of MacLeod Campbell was the natural beauty of his native parish. The loveliness and the wide sea-prospects of Kilninver moulded his mind in the beginning and haunted his memory till the end. They

may almost be said to have created for themselves a counterpart in his inner life. He might have said :—

> "My spirit and my God shall be
> My seaward hill, my boundless sea."

All these things tended to develop in him a temper of fervent serenity, of gentleness and candour, far removed from the sphere of polemical unrest. So that when, in 1825, he was ordained as minister of Row, on the Gareloch, he seemed predestined to a career like that of his father, a life of peaceful scholarly service. Who could have predicted then that he would become the centre of bitter strife, the object of theological hatred, an outcast from the Church of his baptism ?

But there were elements in Campbell's character other than those indicated. The religious liberalism in which he was bred, unobrusive as it was, had yet in it the seeds of change ; and there was in the nature of the man, with all his saintliness and charity, a generous abandonment, a central fire of conviction, an austere fidelity to truth and a tenacity of purpose, which were incalculable forces, and rendered possible the fortunes that befell him. His ministry began with promise of abundant peace. He entered upon his work with no consciousness of theological differences from his fellows. "The fact of an Atonement," he says, "and the necessity of regeneration were the only points which had any decided prominence in my mind."[1] So far as he himself knew, his beliefs were then simply those of all earnest young clergymen ; and he devoted himself zealously to his vocation, especially in the matter of pastoral dealings with his parishioners as to the concerns of the soul, being resolved always "to see his people in the light of the Divine Love." Yet, within an amazingly short time he had contrived to arouse theological suspicion in the sensitive minds of the neighbour-

[1] *Reminiscences*, p. 11.

ing clergy ; " heretics " like Erskine of Linlathen discerned in him a kindred spirit ; rumours of his wild speculations spread throughout the country ; and the watch-dogs of orthodoxy began to growl at the sound of his name. Finally, after long controversy, he was, in the year 1830, libelled by the Presbytery of Dumbarton, on the complaint of twelve parishioners, the charge being that he taught the doctrines of Universal Atonement and Pardon, as well as of Assurance of Faith.

MacLeod Campbell did not deny that he held and had preached these tenets ; and it is interesting to note the account he gave of the origin of his views. He claimed that he had been influenced, not by speculative necessities, but by the constraint of practical experience. He had found his parishioners at Row in a state of great spiritual apathy, and had perceived that what they needed for their awakening was a confident belief that the redeeming love of God in Christ really extended to them. How could they attain such a belief except by the assurance of faith shining in their hearts ? And how could this light be kindled within them unless their pastor were able to declare that the benefits of Christ's redeeming sacrifice were the heritage of every man ? Possessed by these convictions he had gradually come to proclaim the Gospel of universal Pardon and Atonement. " Believe in the forgiveness of sins, because you *are* forgiven." " Believe that Christ died for *you*, because He died for all mankind." " The Cross of Christ is to be seen as the unveiling of God's heart in its movement toward every human being, continually, without ceasing day or night ; whether we pray or whether we withhold prayer ; whether we seek His face or turn from it : this is the heart of God."[1]

Such is Campbell's account of the pathway which led him to " heresy " ; and there can be no doubt of his absolute

[1] *Ibid.*, p. 27 : *Responsibility*, etc., p. 108.

honesty in the matter. We may conjecture, nevertheless, that speculative influences had more to do with the case than he himself knew. He had shown great metaphysical gifts as a student; and he tells us incidentally that discussions with Unitarian comrades in University days had disposed him to regard many important beliefs as open questions. As we shall see, also, his father, whose masters in theology were Tillotson and Samuel Clarke, exercised an important influence in the evolution of his beliefs. The subsequent history of Campbell's thought, too, suggests that something more profound than the requirements of pastoral work lay at the root of his theological growth. His mind was, in effect, a chosen organ of the great and mysterious spiritual impulse which at that time was stirring in all lands, and producing everywhere wonderful fruits in literature, art, politics, philosophy and religion.

But, whatever the origin of Campbell's new beliefs may have been, he embraced them with fervour, and held them with a confidence that was as an inward flame of warm unflickering light. A tone of extreme assurance pervades all his early sermons. At the end of his Row ministry he said: "These things are spoken to you with as much confidence as they ever could have been given out at any time by any creature." "I have uttered not a word that is not to the glory of God."[1] And this accent of dogmatic conviction is found in his private as well as in his public utterances. Indeed, it is difficult to restrain a smile as one reads his letters written at this period. His own views are always referred to as "the truth" and "the gospel"; and those who do not receive them are regarded as the unconscious enemies of "the light." We hear of conferences with ministers in Glasgow; and, from his account of these, it is quite evident that he never contemplated the idea of his being

[1] *Row Heresy*, pp. 440, 465.

convinced, or even influenced, by those who opposed him in argument. He went to Edinburgh once to confer with Chalmers and Irving about his doctrine of Assurance; and Mrs. Oliphant describes him as having gone "to seek counsel." But in one of his epistles he repudiates this notion, and indicates that he went with the sole purpose of convincing Irving and Chalmers. "I did *not* go to consult them. . . . I went in the hope that the grounds of my own convictions would commend themselves to them."[1] Similarly, in his speech before the Synod of Glasgow and Ayr, he said: "A decision of my Presbytery against me gives to the enemy of the souls of my people an advantage in resisting the truth of what I preach."[2] This seems to be a suggestion that the Presbytery had, unwittingly no doubt, allied themselves with evil powers; and Presbyteries do not like suggestions of that kind. It is plain, indeed, that Campbell had all along displayed in his relations with his opponents a certain want of sense, especially the sense of humour. Dr. Graham, in defending the Presbyterial action, complained to the Synod: "In his conversations with us he maintained his principles zealously and perseveringly." Further, Dr. Graham related how his brethren had assured Campbell that if he would only refrain from teaching his peculiar doctrines in their churches, they on their part would refrain from noticing what he might say to his own people. But the young reformer had refused these terms, with the result that they had been obliged in self-defence to exclude him from their pulpits. "He was not merely dogmatical but dictatorial, declaring that he would preach whatever the Spirit dictated to him."[3] All this was distinctly trying to men very much his seniors in the ministry, and not themselves perhaps of the prophetic type; and it partly explains

[1] *Memorials*, I. 52. [2] *Whole Proceedings*, etc., p. 233.
[3] *Whole Proceedings*, p. 235.

the course of events. It is probable that if Campbell had not been quite so aggressive, and had displayed a little more patience and docility, there never would have been a "Row Heresy Case." But then, neither would there have been his book on the Atonement.

Those who recognise in MacLeod Campbell one of the greatest among British theologians will be interested to note the sense in which he held the tenets of which he was accused, as this was stated by him in his defence before the Presbytery. In saying that the atoning work of Christ was of universal import, he did not mean to assert that it actually saved every man, but only that it made salvation possible for every man. When he spoke of universal pardon, also, he intended to teach no more than that the barriers which prevented free return to God had been removed in the case of all men without exception. As to Assurance of Faith, he did not maintain, as had been alleged, that all Christians enjoyed an unbroken consciousness of well-being and peace; but he did maintain that a saving trust in God involved, of its very nature, a glad confidence on the part of the saved that they were in fact reconciled to the Father, and were entirely secure of future blessedness. This confidence might, indeed, suffer periods of eclipse; and such times of darkness did not imply for believers the loss of status as redeemed children of God. They were, however, of the nature of sin, inasmuch as they were not of the nature of faith.[1]

It must be admitted that these positions are not very impressive. The mind of Campbell required to work slowly in order to work exactly; and his opinions had, so far, been formed quickly and under pressure of circumstance. His use of the word "pardon" to express what was not really pardon at all was unfortunate; and there was little meaning in his speaking of a "universal atonement," which in so far

[1] *Whole Proceedings*, pp. 15–50.

as it was universal was futile ; for he admits that at this time he held a modified Calvinism, and one of his own witnesses affirmed his teaching to have been that " only the chosen could come to God."[1] There can, indeed, be no question that his thinking at this stage was confused and contradictory. If anyone is in doubt as to this, let him study the discourses preached towards the end of the Row period, and printed from shorthand notes. The " early sermons " published after Campbell's death had been carefully revised and betray influence of his later thought ; but the report of his actual words, taken down at the moment, shows his teaching as, in 1830, it really was. And it is far from commending itself to the candid reader. No doubt these sermons are sincere, passionate, evangelic ; and they contain the promise of things to come. But they are full of repetition, and their theology is crude. They assert over and over again that universal atonement and pardon have been achieved through " the blood " and " the death " of Christ ; but the references to the Atonement are vaguely worded, and convey as a rule no distinct idea. The most definite statement is : " The blood of Christ took away our sins, and He from whom the offering was accepted received gifts, even the Holy Ghost and the right to reign, for the men for whom He shed His blood." And this seems to imply that a price was paid by Christ, in return for which we receive redemption. Also, an extreme doctrine of total depravity is taught : " There is nothing good in you . . . nothing in any feature of the natural man which forms any exception to the sweeping condemnation of God." " You do naturally hate God and one another." " God have mercy on you, for I see a red cup of the wrath of God mixed for you, and except ye repent ye shall all drink it to the dregs." [2] Thus, it is declared, on the

[1] *Reminiscences*, p. 154; *Whole Proceedings*, p. 151.
[2] *Row Heresy*, pp. 178, 428, 429, 412.

one hand, that every man has been pardoned and his sin removed by Christ. On the other hand, sin is said to remain as a black cloud between men and the Father, so that they are still the object of His wrath and, although members of a redeemed humanity, have in them no good thing and are under a sentence of everlasting damnation. In short, the Row teaching seems to have been an ill-considered combination of extreme orthodoxy with certain incongruous elements which were clearly grasped by the preacher as certainties of personal faith, but not yet *possessed* by him as part of a system of thought.

The weakness which was thus inherent in Campbell's structure of doctrine became evident as soon as it was put to the test of criticism. Throughout his trial he appeared, what he was, a young man conscious of a message which he could not as yet formulate. He was certainly no match, in stated argument, for the expert doctors who confronted him. They knew every subtlety of scholastic Calvinism, and they drew minute and bewildering distinctions with "the easy precision of life-long practice." It was easy indeed for them to pierce him with logical thrusts; and especially easy to prove that his Doctrine of Assurance was either a commonplace or else was inconsistent with the Confession of Faith. Unfortunately, they showed no magnanimity, no consideration, no desire to get at the real thoughts of a fervent and patently honest young apostle. They displayed, instead, a spirit rancorous and ruthless; and they surrounded the whole proceedings with an atmosphere like that of a petty parochial court. Campbell's character was attacked, his motives distorted, his doctrine caricatured. The bitterness with which he was pursued throughout the entire case is indeed inexplicable. His enemies were not even content with his deposition; for the Presbytery of Lorne, after that event, demanded, though in vain, that Dr. Campbell

should read from his pulpit at Kilninver a condemnation and gross travesty of the views held by his beloved son, and should also excommunicate any of his own people who might go to hear the outcast preach.[1]

Still, it remains true that the defence of Campbell when on trial was not a strong one. It is worthy of study only as showing the point from which a great man started on his theological pilgrimage. It is evident that to assert the universality of the Atonement, while retaining the accepted view of its nature, was a hopeless enterprise. If the sufferings of Christ equalled the penalty due from all men, while yet they were destined to achieve release from that penalty in the case only of some, it follows that the price of sin, as respects those finally lost, will in the end have been paid twice over, first by the Saviour and then by the sinners. Campbell himself soon recognised this; and he proceeded then to that radical enquiry into the character of our Lord's redemptive work which issued in the framing of his great constructive theory.

When the trial began, some of Campbell's friends, including Thomas Erskine, hoped that he would be triumphant. But they were soon undeceived. The general sense of ecclesiastical Scotland was against him; his clerical brethren were mostly hostile—only a few, like Story of Rosneath, giving him whole-hearted support; he did not himself offer a very effective *apologia*, and he made the tactical mistake of attacking the Confession of Faith while claiming that his teaching was not contrary to it. Also, he was without the aid of any leading ecclesiastic or professor; for, although Chalmers expressed the hope that he would "be got through," he did nothing to secure that this hope should be realised. And the result was that when Campbell had been condemned by the Presbytery, and his case remitted by the Synod to the

[1] *Memorials*, I. 102.

Assembly, he had no expectation of escape from being deposed. On the eve of the Assembly he wrote to his father bidding him look for no vindication of his son by an earthly court, but expressing a humble confidence that he would be justified before the Bar of Christ.

In point of fact, no one in the Assembly even proposed that Campbell should be acquitted. Any who might have favoured such a course were parties in the case. Besides, the defender practically restated the doctrines for which he was libelled, and took also very high ground as to the right possessed by every Christian minister of teaching what he held to be true. The Assembly had really nothing to decide, therefore, except the question of Campbell's fidelity to the Standards; and no one was ready to assert that he was in fact faithful to the Confession. This being so, the only issue left for decision was the degree of punishment to be inflicted. Nor can it be said that the Venerable Court showed any strong desire to impose the extreme penalty. This was shown by the small number of members who took part in the final vote: only 125 out of more than 300. It was proved also by the motion submitted by Dr. Cook, leader of the Moderates and of the House. Dr. Cook, indeed, remarked that the defender must himself be convinced by this time that he was not in harmony with the Confession; he also said that to grant the liberty that had been claimed would "make an end of the Church of Scotland"; but he declared that a sentence of suspension from the ministerial office would satisfy him. He added, however, that he was willing to go further if the Assembly so desired. It was the Evangelical party that was mainly responsible for the supreme blunder and cruel wrong of utterly casting out of the Church one of the best men she has ever had. For, an Evangelical leader, Lord Moncrieff, was foremost among those who insisted on the decree of deposition: a decree

which was carried with only six dissentients. Thus was justified the forewarning of Chalmers to Campbell: "The Moderation is not half so excited against you as the Evangelicals."[1]

The intensity of feeling which attended the close of this trial was evidenced by a curious confusion of speech on the part of the chief clerk of Assembly. That gentleman meant to declare that the Church of Scotland would flourish long after the opinions of Campbell had passed from memory. But what he really said, in his agitation, was: "These doctrines of Mr. Campbell will remain and flourish long after the Church of Scotland has perished and been forgotten." Thomas Erskine, who was present and noted this, whispered to those behind him: "This he spake, not of himself, but being High Priest—he prophesied."[2] Words of a different and of a moving kind were heard when the venerable Dr. Campbell of Kilninver closed a short and broken speech with the saying: "Moderator, I am not afraid for my son. Though his brethren cast him out, the Master whom he serves will not forsake him. And while I live I will never be ashamed to be the father of so holy and blameless a son."[3] This pathetic tribute was well deserved, as was shown by the conduct of Campbell after his expulsion. When he returned to Row he, of course, found his pulpit closed against him. And so he delivered his farewell message to his parish in the open fields one bright summer morning under a clear and quiet sky. We cannot doubt that his heart was sad that day; for the structure of life lay in ruins around him. Yet he uttered not one word of bitterness, and was content to deliver a purely religious message. Also, when his successor was about to be ordained he spoke again to his people and

[1] *Whole Proceedings*, pp. 169–174.
[2] *Letters* of Thomas Erskine, p. 106.
[3] *Whole Proceedings*, pp. 174–177.

besought for the new comer the same welcome as had cheered himself when first he had come among them.[1] Truly, "he nothing common did or mean."

It seems that Dr. Cook had warrant for his claim that the proceedings in the case must have convinced Mr. Campbell that he was in fact at variance with the Standards of the Church. Indeed, he confessed as much to his friend A. J. Scott as they walked away together from the Assembly that had deposed them both. Scott's statement is memorable: "After the dreary night in the Assembly, the dawn breaking on us as we returned, alike condemned, to our lodgings in the new town of Edinburgh, I turned round and looked on my companion's face under the pale light and asked him, "Could you sign the Confession now?" His answer was, "No, the Assembly was right. Our doctrine and the Confession are incompatible."[2]

The greater number of those who figured in the "Row Heresy Case" are to us mere shadows now, or voices thin and far away. Some, indeed, of the actors in that drama appear to us with greater vividness than their fellows. There is, for instance, the Rev. Dr. Hamilton, enemy of Campbell, a doughty fighter, sturdily waging trivial war. There is Campbell of Kilninver, in whom his son discerned the ideal fatherhood. There is Story of Rosneath, type of the loyal friend. There is the Advocate for the defence, Mr. Carlyle, an able man but too eloquent; later an Irvingite; prone to emotion. He ended a published letter to Hamilton thus: "I entreat you to repent." There is also Dr. Cook, a capable leader, courteous and logical, embarrassed by policy. In the background is the figure of Chalmers, enigmatic and silent; and Thomas Erskine, benign, ironic. But more clearly to be discerned than any separate figures are the two great parties; more plainly to be felt than any individual

[1] *Reminiscences*, p. 40. [2] *Letters* of Thomas Erskine, p. 106.

influence is the ecclesiastical atmosphere of the time, electric, tense, and ominous. Without are the Seceders, vigilant and hostile; within the Church are Moderates and Evangelicals, gathering their forces for the great campaign that ended in '43, each on guard against the other, each unwilling to yield the enemy a point. Dominating all, is the great religious public of Scotland, anxious for the interests of law and order alike in Church and State, and impatient of individual revolts that menaced the structure of authority.

At such a moment, in such an atmosphere, in the presence of forces like these, the cause of Campbell was predestined to disaster. Ecclesiastical leaders, fighting men and partisans are seldom gifted with the wisdom that is able to discern the larger issues of things; and the officials of '31 acted after their kind. Moderates forgot that there is a justice higher than expediency and a liberty that is better than peace. Evangelicals failed to recognise a brother in the fervent young Evangelist who stood at the Bar, faulty in logic but splendid in vision. Both parties alike, concerned with immediate interests and bewildered by logical dilemmas, were blind to the folly of a decision which in effect declared that no one who believed that Christ had died for all men was fit to be a minister of the Scottish Church. And so, both parties combined to banish a man who was yet to prove himself one of the great gifts of God to the Church Universal; combined, also, to drive into the desert a loyal son of the Scottish Establishment, in whose eyes "dissent was schism and schism was sin." Yet, for once, the wrath of man did work the righteousness of God; for an ecclesiastical decision, that was born in strife and completed in blindness, was to have this for its effect, that a prophet was given the freedom and space that he needed for the slow perfecting of his thought, and for the fulfilment of the work that had been given him to do.

J. H. LECKIE.

FACTORS IN THE CHRISTOLOGY OF THE LETTER TO THE HEBREWS.

The difference between a second century and a nineteenth or twentieth century commentator on the Letter to the Hebrews is great. The first has, in this matter at least, the sense of History; the latter have put aside the historical for the religio-philosophical treatment of the book. The second century was taken up with the effort to assert the historical reality of Jesus Christ; our centuries have been occupied with what we have considered to be His contexts. One method is like that of the first century, declarative of the great facts of Jesus Christ; the other method is interpretative of some large ideas in Judæo-Grecian thought down to which those facts have been stripped. The earlier effort was because of the one historic Source of Christianity; the later effort is because of the increasing study of the literary sources of Christianity. This study has not yet done its work; for those sources are still not surely known. It appears to be right to say that the first and second century method cannot be dismissed as being suitable to a simple or unscientific period; and it seems equally right to question the nineteenth and twentieth century method in so far as it has allowed the Philonic formulæ to dissolve the historic facts of the revelation of Jesus Christ. Now the Philonised Christ was never in Galilee. The Gospels tell us that. This, too, is the heart of the message of the second century. Therefore if the attitude of that century to the Letter to the Hebrews, and especially as it reveals the view held of Jesus Christ, can be recovered, then there is some hope of leading towards an answer to the question which continues to perplex us: "What is the Christology of the Letter to the Hebrews?"

A citation from one of the late Professor Marcus Dods's letters will express nearly the whole measure of that perplexity. He writes :—

"The remarkable thing is that with so extraordinarily free a handling of the humanity of Christ and so pronounced a statement of His divinity, the author should yet show no anxiety about reconciling the two, or have any theory of incarnation. His statement of Christ's divinity seems rather to lean upon the Old Testament quotations of the first chapter. Does that seem to you the origin of the belief, and if so, is it not some precarious ?" [1]

There is but one other quality, in our perplexity on this subject, to be added to that passage ; and that quality is to be found in our subscription to the act of making the first chapter to the Letter express Philonisms where it enumerates its claims concerning the being of Jesus Christ. Here then in outline is the attitude of nineteenth and twentieth century students to the Letter and its Christology. It will be noticed that it recognises the author's acceptance of the reality of Christ's coming into the world of men ; and also that this is deemed to be neutralised by his unspeculative view of Christ's divinity based on a precarious use of the Old Testament : whilst he and his view, in the third place, are further neutralised because later students of the Letter find the Christ it expresses in that amorphous and uncalendared country which is the mind of Philo.

But, we may ask, is not the Philonic Christ just the kind of creation we ought to expect from a time of crisis ? The Jewish mind then, even though it has become Christian, would fall back on itself to find its own Saviour. The psychology of the mind excited by the upheaval of its world would lend some force to this question. We should have learnt something of what that means. An illustration from among a collection of psychological phenomena evoked by the awful War will lead the mind in this matter.

[1] *Later! etter of Marcus Dodds, D.D.*, 1911, 296.

A French writer[1] tells us how in the Springtime of 1916 a Capuchin monk was seen to pass along the ranks of the recruits at drill, who said: "Why torture these men? They will not leave for the War, since it will finish in two months' time." The non-commissioned instructor, fearing he had a German spy near him, warned his superior officers; and the monk was followed. Enquiry at the neighbouring monastery came to nought. The soldiers recognised not one of the monks. But in the course of their search they came upon a large portrait hung on one of the walls, and they cried out together: "See! the Father who spoke to us!" The portrait was that of St. Anthony of Padua. The officers and men fell on their knees before the picture. Another report said that Anthony had been seen in the trenches speaking the same prophecy. The blind suggestion, that these phenomena were the work of Latin clergy from a monastery under the power of the Vatican, can be treated as it deserves. It ignores the natural explanation which is that in the time of crisis the general mind creates from either idiom or colour native to it whatever means of release from its surroundings that it desires. Figures, with whom the repair and heading of the world have been associated, lodge in strange mental chambers, whence they come when the emotional experience is big enough to call for them. Thus the soldiers of Republican France will clothe the figure they call up, in contrast to their surroundings, in the garb of their ancestral Catholic France. It seems the necessary human act. History appears to maintain both its necessity and humanity. If then there is as much truth in this deed, why should it not have been done in the first century, and why should not the writer of the Letter to the Hebrews record the deed? The Jerusalem of stone was theirs no longer. They now dwelt in another Jerusalem whose

[1] Dauzat: *Légendes, Prophéties et Superstitions de la Guerre*, 1919, 117.

marble was as fine and durable as the human spirit. Thus it may seem to have been the only thing to do that they should think of a Christ, no longer according to the flesh, but in the terms of the religious idiom which was best and natural to them. The clay of their Christ must suit the marble of their city. These things might be so, if one of the dominant sensations of this Letter, as it finds our minds, was not that of its steadying power. The writer is able to stand away from the crisis of his world. We late readers of his work cannot escape the truth of this achievement. Is his steadying power in ideas seen *sub specie æternitatis*, or in an historic Person? Is the Christ he knows in a Philonic over-world or did He come in Galilee? Is the power of the Christian revelation for him in a mysticism which knows neither dawn nor starlight or in the Christ who came and comes for ever? It is just here that the second century attitude is of help to us, for it is an inheritance from the first century.

This attitude is to be gathered from the short but most valuable writing by Irenæus known as the *Demonstration of Apostolical Preaching*. The literary character of this work may incline us to disregard its historical nature. It is at first difficult to realise that historicity of any kind could be claimed for a treatise which apparently is a series of comments on disconnected pieces from the Old Testament. What connexion is in the *Demonstration* seems then to come from the teaching of Irenæus to his catechumens. The title of the writing and his prologue shew that the first is to be understood as the second is brought into relation with it.[1] What was the reason for the title and the character of the material Irenæus uses? The Old Testa-

[1] This view, with its consequent opinion concerning the historical nature of the *Demonstration* is not brought out in Dean Robinson's translation, nor in Barthoulot and Tixeront, nor in Wilson *Patr. Or.*

ment material which the second-century theologian comments upon represents much of the literary foundations of Apostolical preaching. The *Demonstration* is, so far as its Old Testament material is concerned, a text of the small Christological book which lies behind the whole of the New Testament writings. This makes its historicity. It also explains the title of the book. Further, it gives a decisive reason why Irenæus should base his catechumenal teaching upon such a document. His comments upon the excerpts, though made in his own style, have one end—that is, to establish the reality of Christ's coming into and His work in the world, and for the world unto the ages of the ages. A comparison of the *Demonstration* and the specimens of early first-century preaching in the Acts, or the use of the Old Testament in Gospel or Epistle where Jesus is explaining Himself or has to be explained, will manifest that Irenæus knew the first simple manner of preaching Christ to Palestinian peasants and among the Gentiles. The material was one and the manner the same. The matter and manner Irenæus inherits : his comments are not quite in the declarative manner of the first century, simply because his mind has its own manner and some of his matter is dictated by second-century controversies concerning the historical reality of Jesus Christ. The main interest of his treatise then lies in the fact that its material is from a first-century document which was used earliest of all to shew humble Palestinians, in their own religious idiom, the values and claims of Jesus Christ. He maintains the motive of the earlier book. Thus, when Irenæus inweaves a portion of the Letter to the Hebrews, with its truly related piece from the Old Testament, his comment can only be understood when it is viewed as a comment on a known document and as maintaining the actuality of Jesus Christ. An illustration will shew these points : " And in calling Him

eternal Priest of God, He declares that He is immortal." [1] Then for Irenæus, Jesus is not the Perfect Penitent, according to the modern ecclesiastico-philosophical treatment of Him; nor the mystically personalised cult values of the Hebraic religion, according to the Philonic treatment of Him: "He is the same yesterday, to-day and for ever." The Revealer and the Revelation, who and which had come into Galilee, were for ever. This deduction holds good for the whole of the Irenæan work. It is also the explanation of his larger and better known book *Adversus Haereses*. This second-century Father bases his doctrine upon the polemical substance of the Apostolical sermons—that is to say, the recognised Christological instrument of those who had learnt from Jesus Himself—which polemical substance was accompanied in Apostolical document or speech with the statement of the great facts of the life and dying and rising again of Jesus Christ. History meant true Christianity; and Truth was the Historical Christ.

The modern attitude is still represented by Bishop Westcott's *Commentary* on the Letter to the Hebrews. Before then other features are chosen from the first- and second-century methods, it will be best to indicate afresh the later method. A classic passage from the Letter can be chosen for the purpose of illustration: Hebrews ix. 11–14, 24 ff. It will be found that Westcott (*a*) Typologises; (*b*) Patristicises; (*c*) Ecclesiasticises, and (*d*) Theologises this passage in his *Commentary*. We do so after him. (*a*) His interpretation of the title applied to Jesus, "High Priest of good things realised" epitomises the books and sermons of half a century. He writes: "The Mystery of Christ's title is justified by a description of His work. In the circumstances and the effects of His High-priestly service He offers the Heavenly counterpart of that which was exhibited under

[1] *Demonstration*, c. 48.

an earthly figure in the Mosaic system." This comment has been thought to be true, because it seemed to follow the obvious line of the Letter's thought. It appreciates the apparent literary contrasts of the Letter between the old and the new things ; but only in a weak way, so that there is no antithesis in the end. For to typologise is to yield to the commanding control of the Old Testament in the determination of our views of Jesus Christ. That book controls Him ; He does not control it, as the first and second centuries believed. (*b*) From this position, it would be natural for Westcott to set in contrast to the Tabernacle of the Wilderness, the tabernacle of the " flesh " or " humanity " of Jesus Christ. In this view he follows Chrysostom, Theodoret and Primasius. This view at first may appear to have historical validity. The eminent commentator might seem to have felt that the Letter was on an historic foundation. But Westcott Patristicises ; he does not find his way to the vivid matter of the first-century writer's views. He proceeds to shew that this other Tabernacle " gathers up the various means by which God reveals Himself in the spiritual order, and through which we can approach Him." Thus by the turn of a sentence, what hold was made upon the historic Christ is lost, and He is transmuted into a mystic prototype of the City in which God dwells, and whose gates of approach are equal in number on all its walls. The commentator has yielded to fourth-century traditionalism. He has placed two centuries between his mind and the Letter. (*c*) Therefore, it is to be expected that his next step will be to assert that by the later Tabernacle, the Church is meant ; for, he says, " in this Body, as a spiritual Temple, Christ is minister." The fourth-century impulse is still strong upon him ; for then, as now, it was easy to unmake Jesus Christ into the Church. Thus to ecclesiasticise the Letter to the Hebrews is to maintain as its message a con-

trast between a good and a better institution—between a Hebrew Tabernacle or Temple and a Christian Church, and not a contrast between an institution and a Person,—between a cult scheme of worship and One who, in being and deed and word, had come to make that revelation which disestablished it for ever. (*d*) With this order of valuations for the passage, Wescott goes on to the phrase and its context: διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου. This he declares to be the personal possession of Jesus Christ, His spirit. Once more, the commentator approaches the first-century writer's *real* view of Jesus Christ and His work; and as quickly he passes from it to the speculations of other theologies. Westcott writes on the phrase: "It could not be said of any man absolutely that his spirit is eternal; but Christ's Spirit is in virtue of His Divine Personality eternal. By this, while truly man, He remained in unbroken connexion with God." Then he adds that the "eternal spirit" included the limited spirit of the Lord's humanity; and that the possession of these two in "perfect harmony" will account for the personality of Jesus Christ. Hence, with these institutional and theological ways with the Letter in mind, he moves on to shew that its author, knowing that the death of Jesus Christ was one of the chief difficulties of the Hebrews, "presents it under different aspects in order to shew its full significance in the Christian dispensation." The whole of these views have become most familiar, but to theologise is to depress the language of the Letter to other, and therefore anachronous, connotations. The first simple language of great facts is made into the foreign language of later ideas. These matters mark the profound difference between the earlier and later commentators on the Letter to the Hebrews. There is then a problem of a right and wrong interpretation of the Letter.

Two very important matters of literary structure, con-

cerning the Letter, seem as yet to have been overlooked. The first is that the Letter is anti-Judaic and not pro-Judaic. It is not an Apology, but a Polemic. Its much discussed title, Letter to the Hebrews, has inclined us to the former view. That inclination has been helped by our timid realisations of the powers of the antitheses in the Letter. They will be spoken about soon. The understanding of the title of the Letter is surely possible only on the grounds of the late Professor Gwatkin's fine conjecture, which was, that the document was written to Jews who had taken refuge from Jerusalem, say in the high regions of Pella. They were face to face with the crisis of their world. Theirs was the mental fight to build another Jerusalem. To these comes the clear-sighted and gifted writer of the Letter with the stimulating energies of the message of Christ's first people. The polemical side of that message cut them away, with its tonic qualities, from all old things—city, cults and concepts ; whilst the evangelical side of that message brought them, with its qualities of revelation, into possession of the new Person and His energies—His gathering of the redeemed, His redemption and Redeemership. Now it is these two sides of that message which cause the antitheses of the Letter. They are clear-cut ; so also are the antitheses of the Letter. The contrasts which the writer makes are not virtual but final. The lines of his literary workmanship are obedient to the factors of the Christian message which was common to the disciples of Jesus Christ in the first century. This Letter is like that to the Galatians, for example : it was not written to do apologetic work but to declare the things which could not be shaken though the very earth falls into ruins. If these contrasts, with their powers of assertion of the historic and living Christ, are found again in the ninth chapter of the Letter to the Hebrews, the ways and thoughts of the

writer can be rediscovered. The jejune antithesis between old and new institutions, the ancient temple and the new Church, will be seen to be outside his thought. He will not be found to be the originator of a mystical play on the term "tabernacle." There is for him no building upwards from imperfect buildings and ceremonies among the Hebrews to a perfect Church and ritual among the Christians. His contrasts cleave to the marrow of things, and here they are between discarded ancient institutions and the Person and work of Jesus Christ; that is, the causes of their being discarded. The writer asserts the deathless Redeemer and His revelation of Life. It is because He is the new revelation that He brought to light eternal redemption. The immediate and energetic relation of these two phases is notable. It is the Jesus Christ who came that redeems, and not another. But Westcott sets up the altar again in his explanation of εὑρόμενος. His view, and ours, is a formal one; it is not in energy. The word, however, is not static; it must be read with the phrase διὰ πνεύματος αἰωνίου—which is not a reference to the third Person in the Trinity, but a descriptive concerning personal ceaseless and timeless operation. For the writer of the Letter, the dying of Jesus Christ shewed His eternal work for men. The Worker revealed the travail of His work in the facts of His life on earth. We could not understand this, nor do we yet understand, without the Cross on which He shewed how He bears, and has borne, away the sins of the world. We may criticise the statement how we will, but for the writer of this Letter, and for the first century, Jesus Christ was God who had come in the conditions of manhood. That indeed is what is meant when we speak of His unique revelation, if words are used with a view of expressing what they mean. Thus then His first folk could understand, and so may we, why He was before the eye of the world for three

short years ; since in them by word and deed He told, in ways which the simple Palestinian mind could grasp and then send on into the world of men, who and what He was : " See who I am, and how I have worked and am working unto the endless ages ! " The author of the Letter is sensitive towards the historic revelation of redemption as direct personal work and energy, and not as objective manifestation. This latter notion belongs to much later speculation. A great word of his in the fifth chapter is in point here. There he speaks of Jesus Christ as the αἴτιος of eternal salvation. That is to say, it is the actual and costly work of Him who has been and is and shall be for ever. The meaning of this term can best be brought out by comparing a passage from a book by the most delicately sensitive authority on Greek literature. Professor Gilbert Murray [1] writes on Greek plays : " For the play is, with the rarest and most doubtful exceptions, essentially the enactment of a ritual, or rather of what the Greeks called an " aition,"—that is, a supposed historical event which is the origin or " cause " of the ritual. Thus the death of Hippolytus is the " aition " of the lamentation-rite performed at the grave of Hippolytus ; the death of Aias is the " aition " of the festival called Aianteia ; the death of Medea's children, the " aition " of a certain ritual at Corinth ; the story of Prometheus the " aition " of a certain Fire-festival in Athens. The tragedy, as ritual, enacts its own legendary origin." The difference between the impersonal " aition " and the personal " aitios " would lead to the rewriting of Professor Murray's last sentence in this fashion : " The Christology, as Gospel, enacts its own historical origin." This is true for the Letter to the Hebrews, and as well for the Christian mind of the first century. There is no New Testament writing for which essentially that " aitios " is not the motive

[1] *Euripides and His Age*, 1919, 66.

of its message. The fifth chapter of the Letter, for instance, can go back into the text of the Gospels. It simply says what a true onlooker must say about Jesus Christ. Its ineffable summary is in the phrase: "My Lord and my God." Our later theories about Jesus Christ and His work give to "aitios" the same value as to "aition" in the Greek plays. The sense of the immediate, historic and personal is lost; and He becomes a factor, of talewise quality, in the ritual of Redemption. For those who saw Jesus and those who came in the first morrow of His life, His revelation was Himself as Redeemer and Redemption, and these as His unique work and end of being—so unparalleled was He and His revelation that the whole scheme of Hebraic religion was annulled. He did not transcend it, He swept it aside. There can be no wonder that the Jews killed Him. The above matters are factors, it appears, in the mind of the writer of this Letter to the Hebrews as he pens a message of release to those who had come out from an ancestral Jerusalem to the city whose centre and light is Jesus Christ.

VACHER BURCH.

THE MARCAN 'ΕΠΙΡΑΠΤΕΙ.

IN the course of a comparative study of the parallel texts of Matthew and Mark, my attention has been called to the supposedly rare word *ἐπιράπτει* in Mark ii. 21. In support of rarity two Synoptic scholars may be quoted. Dr. Edwin A. Abbott, in *Encyclopaedia Biblica*, art. *Gospels*, col. 1766, in effect cites the Matthaean writer as making the substitution of "*ἐπιβάλλει* for the unheard of *ἐπιράπτει*." Professor Sir John Hawkins, *Horae Synopticae* (1909), p. 132, in the course of an enumeration of peculiarities of

Mark, says: "... *ἐπιράπτει*, a verb found nowhere else in Greek."

As a matter of fact, the word was undoubtedly current in N.T. times, as it was in use as early as Theophrastus and is apparently not yet obsolete. Here is a life over two millenniums long. It must therefore have been a vigorous one. The Marcan use occurred, say, 400 years from the one terminus and 1800 years from the other—consequently, at a time when the word was neither just coming into use nor just going out of service. In view of the foregoing considerations, one is entitled to claim currency in N.T. times.

If the reader will turn to Theophrastus' *Characteres*, *The Superstitious Man*, 28 (16). 2, he will find the following passage:

καὶ ἐὰν μῦς θύλακον ἀλφίτων διαφάγῃ, πρὸς τὸν ἐξηγητὴν ἐλθὼν ἐρωτᾶν τί χρὴ ποιεῖν· καὶ ἐὰν ἀποκρίνηται αὐτῷ, ἐκδοῦναι τῷ σκυτοδέψῃ ἐπιῤῥάψαι, μὴ προσέχειν τούτοις, ἀλλ' ἀποτραπεὶς ἐκθύσασθαι.

Anna Comnena in the first half of the twelfth Christian century, *Alexiad*, 5. 8 and 14. 9, uses the word twice:

οὐδὲ αὐτάρκες ἦν αὐτῷ τὸ ἐπιῤῥάψαι τοῦ ἀντικειμένου τὸ στόμα καὶ σιγὴν αὐτῷ καταψηφίεῖσθαι.

ὁ δὲ αὐτοκράτωρ τὰς πάσας τούτων διαλύων ὡς ἱστὸν ἀράχνης ἐνστάσεις ἐπέῤῥαπτε μὲν εὐθὺς τῶν ἀκαθάρτων τὰ στόματα.

Finally, N. Contopoulos in his *Modern Greek-English Lexicon* (Athens, 1907) enters the word in his list and defines it.

J. F. Springer.

THE BURNING PROBLEM OF THE HOUR IN OLD TESTAMENT RELIGIOUS HISTORY.

SOME decades ago the most important question in the field of Old Testament criticism, as far as it concerns the history of religion, was whether the true religion of Israel was created by the prophets of the eighth century. For several years past this question has happily become of minor significance. For the latest work on the development of Old Testament religion supplies the correct solution: "The prophets are not to be regarded as innovators, but as reformers." [1] But while on this point and on many others its author accepts the conclusions I have maintained [2] as regards Old Testament writings, he traces the true religion of the Old Testament no farther back than the time of Moses. He is silent as to the religion of the patriarchs. In that matter he holds with the critics [3] who deny that the first stage of Old Testament religion is to be found in the religion of Abraham and the other patriarchs.

There is, therefore, at the present time no more burning question than this, Did the history of Old Testament religion begin with the call of Abraham or not? In the

[1] Albert C. Knudson, *The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament* (New York, 1919), p. 31 f.

[2] In my *Geschichte der alt-testamentlichen Religion kritisch dargestellt* (2nd edition, 1915).

[3] E.g. Stade, Marti; Kautzsch (in Hastings' *Bible Dictionary*, Vol. V., pp. 612, 624).

following article I have attempted to give, as concisely as possible, an answer to this inquiry.

On what grounds do so many writers on the history of Israel refuse at the present time to date the commencement of the true religion of that people from the era of the patriarchs? The answer is not exactly easy, but a threefold explanation may be suggested.

In the first place, we have, in the opinion of these authors, no trustworthy records of pre-Mosaic times. Next, they regard it as doubtful whether the patriarchs ever existed. Thirdly, they believe that the patriarchs, even if we regard them as historical personages, possessed only a low type of religion. My task, therefore, must be to consider these three aspects of the problem.

I.

Take the first question: "Have we sufficient trustworthy information about the epoch of the patriarchs?" In briefest summary, I suggest the following reply.

As regards the age of the principal sources from which we may derive information about the patriarchs, a widely prevalent opinion just now is that they were written in the ninth and eighth centuries. That view is maintained in Knudson's book, from which I have quoted above (pp. 27, 44). If the pronouncement in that work represented all that could be said as to the sources of our knowledge of the patriarchal age, grave doubt would unquestionably be thrown upon the accuracy of the Biblical narratives about that period. But in my judgment the assertion must be altered and expanded, as I now proceed to show.

To begin with, my researches have led me to the conclusion that one of these main sources, the Elohistic narrative (E), which is regarded by myself and by at least six other scholars as the earliest, must be dated from the latter

part of the period of the Judges. A primary reason for this decision is the preference given to the Divine name 'Elohîm and ha-'elohîm as the subject of the sentence (Gen. xx. 6, etc.), as Jahve is also avoided even more in the proper names of Israel before the age of David.[1]

The other of the two oldest sources on the patriarchal age, the Jahvistic stratum of the Pentateuch (J), cannot be assigned to an earlier age than David's, because of its preference for the word "Jahve" as the Divine name, but there is no reason whatever to postdate it beyond the reign of Solomon. On the contrary, we have every right to assume that the political and intellectual uplift which marked the reigns of David and Solomon was accompanied by an advance in literary development. Far weightier, however, is the next remark with which I am able to amplify Knudson's bald statement as to the sources of the oldest history of Israel. That writer *has not a word to say about the foundations* of these two main strata of the Pentateuch.

These foundations would be important in deciding the authority of the Pentateuchal strata, even if they had consisted only in material handed down from *oral tradition*. For it is an undeniable fact that the memory of men in those ages when the art of writing was unknown, possessed a very high degree of elasticity. Have we not a clear proof of this as we examine the literature of India and Greece? The 1028 Hymns which form the Rigveda were preserved through oral tradition, until, shortly before the time of Buddha (557–477), the art of writing was introduced into India. Homer's Epics, in the same way, took their form solely through the labour of memory, and were passed on as a legacy from century to century.[2] And we must add

[1] Complete proofs as regards this dating will be found in my *Commentary on Genesis* (1919, Bertelsmann, Gütersloh), pp. 54–64.

[2] Theod. Birt, "Abriss des antiken Buchwesens" in Iwan Müller's *Handbuch der klassischen Altertumskunde*, I. 3 (1913, p. 246).

this further observation, that oral tradition, if through it alone the memories of Israel were handed down from Abraham to Moses, did not have to cover very many generations. For my own investigation has established the fact, that the number of generations which lived in the separate families of Israel from the sons of Jacob until Moses, varied between four and seven, while the number eleven is mentioned only once.[1] Therefore it is not the fact, as a recent writer[2] has maintained, that it is impossible to think of any way in which tidings about the patriarchs can have come down to the Biblical narrators.

We should be entitled to say as much as this even if we were obliged to admit that from the time of the patriarchs to that of the Elohistic historian the preservation of the oldest facts was in the guardianship of oral tradition only. But are we justified in making this assumption with certainty ?

I answer that, far from being certain, the assumption is not even probable. For the statement which was frequently made towards the end of last century, that the Israelites even in the age of Moses were an illiterate horde, has lost the last gleam of probability since 1902. In that year the pillars with the code of Hammurabi were discovered at Schuster in Persia,[3] and on § 128 we read, " If any man takes a wife, but makes no contract with her, the woman is not his true wife." As the mere posting up in a public place of this law implies a knowledge of written characters among the subjects, the various paragraphs (§§ 151, 171 f.) in which written contracts are mentioned, lead us to the same conclusion. We see, then, that Abra-

[1] Numbers xxvi. 5–10 f. See the full discussion in my *Kommentar zur Genesis*, p. 92.

[2] Gunkel in his *Commentary on Genesis* (1910), p. ix.

[3] Cf. e.g. H. Winckler, *Die Gesetze Hammurabi's übersetzt* (1902).

ham emigrated from a land (Gen. xi. 28) in which the above conditions prevailed as to the use of writing. Does it not seem an unnatural thing to take it for granted, as some recent writers have done, *that this particular man alone was unacquainted with the art of writing?* Further, the mention of Judah's signet ring (Gen. xxxviii. 18) is no longer such an isolated reference as it once was. For the excavations have brought to light large numbers of signets with letters, e.g., the seal of Schema', found at Megiddo in 1904,[1] etc. Herodotus also says of the Babylonians (i. 195) that "each one has a signet." Nor must we forget the existence of a place in Palestine with the ancient name "writing-town" [Schriftstadt] (Joshua xv. 15 f.).

Taking the above facts together, we may assume it as possible and indeed highly probable that *even in the age before Moses* short *written notices* were drawn up among the Hebrews with regard to important matters; at the very least, brief records of tribal pedigrees or of important acquisitions, such, for example, as the cave of Machpelah (Gen. xxiii. 3 ff.). I acknowledge with regret that some newer writers seem to regard even this admission as doubtful.[2] But why should we deny to the ancestors of Israel a custom so probable as the use of writing for the occasional publication of weighty matters, while ascribing to them, on the other hand, a habit quite against nature, namely the neglect of their ancient memories? Not only is it true that we have no justification for attributing to the ancestors of Israel such a want of care for the preservation of old remembered things, but positive proofs to the contrary may be brought forward, as I shall now proceed to indicate. The people of Israel, before all others, *might have*

[1] E.g. in S. Landersdorfer, *Die Kultur der Babylonier und Assyrier* (1913), p. 32.

[2] Including e.g. Kittel *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. I. (1916), p. 415.

been expected to have a keen desire to cherish ancient recollections. In all lands and ages, has it not been the custom among families, who possess dear and precious memories, to pass them on from generation to generation ? Nobody has yet succeeded in proving that the people of Israel possessed *no* precious treasures of memory about the beginnings of their nation and religion. Therefore it is possible, to say the least, that this people from its very origins possessed an eager interest in the guarding of its venerable traditions, and strove to hand them down to posterity.

We are not dealing, however, with a mere possibility. Many facts prove that the people of Israel did indeed possess an earnest desire that the ancient memories of the race should be preserved with loving care.

Amongst these facts I may choose some examples as follows :

(*a*) The people of Israel actually displayed a watchful attentiveness to the stages of historical progress. How often, for instance, is the change of place-names noted ! The list opens with the words, " Bela, which is [the later] Zoar " (Gen. xiv. 2). The time when a town was built (Num. xiii. 22) or when a popular custom was introduced (1 Sam. xxx. 25) had its importance for the historical interest of Israel. In the same way the first mention of a new name for the Divine Being is noted (Exodus vi. 2 f.) or a change in reference to the prophets (1 Sam. ix. 9) ; and mention is made of old and new names for the months (1 Kings vi. 38, etc.).

The custom of introducing music in divine worship is traced back to the time of David (cf. Neh. xii. 24 and further passages).[1]

(*b*) The Israelites, moreover, were accustomed to provide

[1] Readers will find them in the group collected in my *Commentary on Genesis* (pp. 84–86).

for themselves concrete aids to memory. Among these helps and supports we may mention old trees, such as the tamarisk which Abraham planted at Beersheba (Gen. xxi. 33 J.). Although this tree was meant in the first place to mark out a place of worship, yet the longæval tamarisk must have gathered the peoples' memories about its ancient stem. Similar associations must have clung very closely to the burial cave at Hebron, which is mentioned five times in the Book of Genesis (xxiii. 20, etc.). Other aids to memory were the altars and pillars built to commemorate a religious experience (xxviii. 18 E ff.); the cairn of witness (xxxi. 46, 47); the pot of manna, and so forth; certain customs, such as the telling to each younger generation how the Passover feast originated (Exodus xiii. 8–10). And let us not overlook the plainest of all methods by which the old memories were preserved in their pristine purity. That method, of course, was *the preparation of books* in which the recollections were written down. Were there no such books in ancient Israel? [1] Two of them are expressly quoted. The first was "The Book of the Wars of the Lord" (Num. xxi. 14), i.e. the writing which described the battles waged under the invisible leadership of Jahve, to the honour of His name and for the protection of His people. Might not the fundamental facts about Abraham's campaign against Chedorlaomer (Gen. xiv.) have been preserved very easily in that place? The second ancient book, which is expressly cited as a source, is "The Book of the Upright" [Jashar] (Joshua x. 13; 2 Sam. i. 18), which, as both quotations indicate, was a collection of poems. Now the latest research has made it clear that poetical writings are the oldest elements of many literatures.[2]

[1] We might almost be led to suppose so, since even Knudson has not a word to say about these sources.

[2] Ed. Norden, *Antike Kunstprosa*, Vol. I., p. 28.

And this living interest which, as many signs prove, the Israelites possessed for the preservation of their memories, was by no means barren in results. On the contrary, a fairly long list of proofs might be set forth to show that the historical literature of Israel, even as far as it concerns the earlier ages, is trustworthy in a very high degree. Let us, to begin with, look at the following examples of such proofs. The statement of Genesis ii. 14, that the river Tigris "goeth toward the east of Assyria" was true only before 1300 B.C.[1]

The mention (x. 8) of the non-Semitic population of Babylonia has an actual parallel in the non-Semitic Sumerians. Are the Chaldeans otherwise mentioned in the racial lists? No, the observant eyes of the Israelites had not overlooked the fact that it was only at a later date that the Chaldeans acquired a dominating position in Babylonia (cf. Isaiah xxiii. 13; 2 Kings xx. 1 ff.) We are surprised at the first glance to find that the Elamites in Genesis x. 22 are ranked among the Semites. But during the excavations at Susa, which was the capital of Elam, underneath the Elam of history which is of Aryan origin, remains have been found of an ancient Semitic civilisation.[2]

The Biblical statement that Abraham had transactions with the Hittites at Hebron (Gen. xxiii. 3 ff.) has in recent times been a subject of doubt and even of mockery.[3] But the testimony of the Amarna letters proved the accuracy of this assertion of Scripture.[4] And we may say of a whole class of passages that they afford proofs of the reliability of the Old Testament historical books by the very frankness with which they judge the faults of the Israelites as a

[1] Gressmann in the *Archiv für Religionswissenschaft* (1907), p. 347.
[2] Recognised by Driver among others, *Book of Genesis* (1910), p. 120.
[3] E.g. in Stade's *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*, Vol. I., p. 143.
[4] For a full explanation see my *Commentary on Genesis*, xxiii. 20.

people, and of many individuals amongst them. This is a special characteristic of their writings. Are there any other historical books of antiquity which censure so sharply the writer's own people? There is an almost unbroken series of passages in which the rebellion of Israel against Moses, and their unfaithfulness to God are sternly reproved (Exodus xvi. 2 etc., xxxii. 1 etc.). Above all, it stands to the credit of these historians that in dealing with persons whose lives as a whole deserved praise, they did not keep silence about their weaknesses and failings. Are we not told even of Moses (Num. xx. 12, etc.) that when he struck the rock twice instead of speaking to it, he disbelieved God for a moment? And is it not also a proof of the trustworthiness of these historical books that they tell us, e.g., of the shameful captivity of Israel in Egypt? Historians who had dreamed out a picture of their peoples' past according to a kind of historical philosophy[1] would have carefully avoided painting into the picture the many dark lines which we discover in the record of Israel's past.

In the second place we must keep in mind a fact of predominating importance. That is *the marking out of a pre-Mosaic period* in the historical existence of Israel. All the splendour in which the Mosaic epoch shone forth as the age of Israel's youth (Hosea xi. 1) involved no paling of the light which gleamed from pre-Mosaic times. Notwithstanding the supreme greatness of Moses as the divinely favoured organiser of a critical change, a new turning point in the existence of Israel, Abraham and Jacob are recognised as the beginners of the national existence, and of the separate religious position of the Hebrew race. Yet how natural it would have been to concentrate within the age of Moses all the principles of the national and religious life! We

[1] It is on these lines that H. Schneider (*Zwei Aufsätze zur Religionsgeschichte*, 1909) characterises the historians of the Old Testament.

can guess from later accounts of the earliest times how very easily this might have happened. A well-known later document [1] obliterates the distinction between the Mosaic and the pre-Mosaic periods. For it represents the patriarchs, e.g., as celebrating the feast of the first-fruits of their crops, and as offering incense on the altar (ch. xv. § 1 f.). Why did the older historical books keep the periods of development so clearly separate? The historians of Israel, in dealing with these earlier times, must have based their narrative on firmer facts that many recent writers have admitted.

The distinction of a pre-Mosaic period is in any case of vital importance for a just appreciation of the Old Testament historical books. If I can succeed in winning a general acceptance of this fact, a great service will thereby have been rendered to Biblical truth.

On the basis of all these facts, which have here been set forth with the utmost possible brevity, it must surely be admitted that there does exist reliable information about the patriarchal age. Our confidence will be further strengthened if in the sifting of these facts we follow the principle of true criticism which was laid down by Lessing. He says in his *Duplik* [2]: "If Livy and Polybius and Dionysius and Tacitus describe the same event—let us say the same battle or the same siege—with such very different circumstantial details that the details of the one absolutely contradict the details of the other, has the event itself, as to the reality of which they all agree, ever been denied?" I have ventured to revive this principle and have often argued that at least the material which the principal sources have in common in reference to a particular period must be accepted as the ground-work of the narrative. If this

[1] *The Book of Jubilees*, dated about 170 B.C.

[2] Lessing's *Werke* in the Reclam edition, Vol. VI., p. 233.

is acknowledged, for example, with regard to the patriarchal age, the science of history will lose nothing of its dignity.

II.

When the basic principle has been once established which enables us to answer the question, "Was the religion of the patriarchs the first stage of Old Testament religion?" a second special inquiry presents itself: "Is it not very doubtful whether the patriarchs actually existed?" I proceed very briefly to set forth my answer.

If we are to apply the above-mentioned principle of genuine criticism, there is one remark which must be made at the outset with reference to the modern doubt as to the personal existence of the patriarchs. It is a common feature of the narrative as given in all sources, that the patriarchs did live as actual individuals.

There are undoubtedly certain differences in the account given in the separate strata of the Pentateuch with regard to Abraham. To take a single instance, his call is represented in one source as having first taken place at Charran in Mesopotamia. For the words, "Get thee out of thy country," etc. (Gen. xii. 1 J), taken in connexion with the preceding sentences (xi. 31 f.) indicate this as the place. But in xv. 7 Ur of the Chaldees is mentioned as the spot where the special relationship of Abraham to God was established. The discrepancy may in all likelihood be explained by the circumstance that in chapter xv. the Elohistic and the Jahvistic sources converge into one stream. But how unimportant is this difference as compared with the great fact *common* to both sources, the fact that Abraham *did* receive a special call from God. The same proportional value attaches to the shades of colour in these ancient streams of narrative, as contrasted with the material common to one and all. Such points of agreement abound

in the history of Abraham. At least two or even three sources speak of his father Terah and his brother Nahor (Gen. xi. 26 P, xxiv. 15 J ; Josh. xxiv. 2 E) and of his marriage with Sarah (Gen. xi. 29 P, xii. 12 J, xx. 2 E). Other instances are given in my Commentary on Genesis (1919), p. 79.

All the statements which are common to the various sources testify to the *individual existence* of the patriarchs. Each stratum of the Pentateuch describes their birth, their marriage, their children, their relationships with other actual persons, their actions and their deaths, precisely in the same way as records are given of other personages whose individual existence is denied by none.

If we examine the matter more particularly as it concerns the first patriarch, the following positive facts speak for his existence as a distinct personality : (*a*) the circumstance that the sources represent him as having lived in great simplicity, and as a merely tolerated dweller in the land of Canaan. The career of an imaginary patriarch would have been set forth with greater splendour. We know full well what glowing images arise when fancy works with palette and paint brush ! That remark is specially applicable to the first patriarch. For in later times legend did throw a glory over his figure and placed him on a throne. He was represented as king of Damascus.[1]

(*b*) Further, we recall the family burial-place, which is mentioned five times in various sources : Genesis xxiii. 17 ; xxv. 20 P ; xlvii. 19 f. J ; xlix. 29 P.

(*c*) A third fact pointing in the same direction is the mention of Abraham in Isaiah xxix. 22, Micah vii. 20, etc. If Jacob's name is mentioned even more frequently (Hos. xii. 3 f., etc.), this may be accounted for by the fact that the latter belonged more exclusively to Israel.

[1] Justinus, *Historiarum Liber*, xxxvi. 2. Josephus, *Antiquitates*, I. 7. 1 f., etc.

(*d*) Noteworthy also is the mention of a place-name, "field of Abraham," in the list of places which were conquered by Shishak, king of Egypt, in his campaign against Rehoboam. This list is regarded by modern Egyptologists as genuine and important.[1]

(*e*) The name Abram is a naturally formed word, which might easily have denoted an individual person. For just as, e.g., the name Abiner was contracted to Abner (1 Sam. xiv. 50 f.), the name Abiram which in other passages (Num. xvi. 1, etc.) denotes individual persons, was contracted, in the case of such an often named man, to Abram. It was, in the opinion of various writers,[2] from the beginning a "name given to human persons," and this is confirmed by the Babylonian name Abiram, which was borne by an eponymous of the year 677–76.[3]

These positive testimonies to the existence of the first patriarch as a real and individual personality could not be robbed of their value, even if a certain degree of probability were allowed to the arguments which have been employed in recent times on the unreality and the original nature of the patriarchs. These arguments fall into the following groups:

(*a*) The view which is now chiefly prevalent regards the patriarchs as *personifications of tribes*. But this theory encounters the greatest difficulties when applied to Abraham, for what tribe or racial stem is supposed to have been personified in him? A reply given recently is that "in Abraham the characteristic nomad, the Hebrew-Chabiri" may be personified.[4] To which I reply, first, that Abraham

[1] E.g. G. Roeder in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (1912), p. 355.

[2] E.g. Cornill in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* (1914), p. 151.

[3] Rogers, *Cuneiform Parallels to the Old Testament* (1912), p. 225.

[4] Herm. Weinheimer in the *Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft* (1912), p. 365 f.

was no typical or distinctive nomad, but at the most a so-called semi-nomad, a fact which has been recognised more and more distinctly in recent years. For he lived in towns such as Gerar, Beersheba, Hebron, and despised neither wealth nor the products of culture (Gen. xxiv. 22, 53).[1] In the second place the Chabiri, who are mentioned in the Amarna letters 179–185, were a people who from Seir and other south-eastern districts undertook predatory campaigns against Jerusalem, and hence must be regarded as non-Israelitish Hebrews, i.e. the Ishmaelites, Edomites, etc. (cf. further in my *Commentary on Genesis*, p. 410). Nor can we discover in the case of Isaac any tribal stem which might have been personified in him. The case of Jacob would not, of course, present the same difficulties. But let us imagine, e.g., that because of the later historical relations of the people of Israel to the Edomite population the whole narrative which describes Esau's conduct at the alienation of his birthright, etc., is a pure piece of fiction (Gen. xxv. 31 ff.). As such an origin of these particular narratives must appear quite too unnatural, we may regard it as an artificial or rather an entirely impossible conception that all the other narratives which we read in the sources about the third patriarch have been worked up in accordance with the later destinies of the people of Israel. Could anything be more unnatural than that the later generations of Israel, who began their history, not with an account of their tribes, but with the story of individual persons, should actually have moulded the life-course of these persons in accordance with the subsequent fortunes of the people? In my Commentary I have shown in careful detail (p. 94 f. after xxx. 24 and before xxxix. 1) that the narratives given in Genesis about these tribal fathers cannot

[1] This matter is examined in detail in my *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion* (1915), pp. 133–135.

in any way have been derived from the history of the later tribes. We are asked to believe that Israel looked back, beyond the twelve heads of tribes, to three ancient patriarchs *who followed each other in direct succession*, and yet that these three men had no actual existence in the traditions of the race. Surely that would have been a miracle. And this miracle is supposed to have happened, notwithstanding the fact that the early historians wove no other miracles into the patriarchal age.

(*b*) According to another widely diffused opinion of recent times, the patriarchs derived their origin from *mythological figures*. Supporters of this view take their stand on the following hypotheses: (1) Abraham was originally a fetish-stone.[1] But the only passage which affords the faintest justification for this conjecture is Isaiah li. 1 f., where the first patriarch is described as the rock out of which Israel was hewn. But these words, as every one must see from the context, were used in a purely metaphorical sense. (2) Further, the figure of Abraham has been interpreted with reference to the starry sky.[2] In the sources, however, it is only the posterity of this man which is compared to the stars of the sky for multitude (xv. 5), and it is not without interest to observe that the relation of Abraham to the stars is much more indirect, according to the earliest sources, than in later mentions of him. For Jewish narratives declare that the Chaldean astrologers predicted the rule of a son of Terah, and the Koran asserts in detail that Abraham rejected one after another the stars, the moon and the sun as objects of worship, "and turned his countenance towards Him who created heaven and earth." Yet again it has been suggested that the moon-god was the figure which was trans-

[1] Dozy, *De Israeliten te Mekka* (1864), p. 21 ff.
[2] Ignaz Goldziher, *Der Mythus bei den Hebräern* (1870), p. 109.

formed to that of Abraham.[1] What an arbitrary genetic contrast is thus invented between two great ones between whom in reality there was merely an outward connexion! The first patriarch did indeed dwell first in a town in which the moon-god (Sin) was the chief object of worship. But even if he himself had at the beginning taken part in such worship, it would be illogical to identify him with the object of his veneration. As a matter of fact he actually severed himself from such worship. Surely that of itself should be sufficient to refute those critics who suggest a positive connexion between the moon-god and Abraham.

But we need say no more about these various attempts. The figures of Abraham and of the patriarchs in general, which are mirrored for us in the sources—and the historian knows nothing of any other presentations of these ancient fathers—are in no point exalted above the human plane. From birth to death they come before the reader as human beings, and there is not even the slightest trace in the sources of a reverence paid to these personages, as if they had been local gods (so-called *genii loci*).[2]

Putting all these facts together, we are entitled to give an affirmative answer to the second question which was suggested at the opening of this article. The common testimony of the earliest sources, according to which the patriarchs *existed in reality and as distinct personages*, cannot be challenged except by unfounded and unmethodical arguments.

III.

Let us finally consider the question whether the religion of the patriarchs belonged to so very low a religious stage, that it cannot be accepted as the first stage of Old Testa-

[1] Hugo Winckler, *Geschichte Israels*, Vol. II. (1900), p. 21.

[2] Further details may be found in my *Commentary on Genesis* (pp. 442, 444).

ment religion. The discussion is all the more timely because at the present time quite a number of writers on the history of Israel's religion [1] are vieing with one another in lowering the religious conditions of the patriarchal age to the level of fetishism, ancestral worship and polytheism. The task seems therefore incumbent upon me to submit all these newer theories in their order to a careful examination. The question as to the fetishistic and animistic character of patriarchal religion has, however, already been explored by me on all sides.[2] Readers may therefore find it more interesting if instead of dealing with these three questions I examine one of them only in somewhat full detail. This third question, which concerns *the polytheistic character of patriarchal religion*, deserves consideration on two other grounds. In recent times a work of almost 700 pages [3] has been written for the purpose of supporting the theory that polytheism was the true religion of the patriarchs and of ancient Israel as a whole. In the second place a Hebrew form plays so grave a part in the defence of this opinion that I gladly make use of this opportunity of placing it in the clearest possible light, and thus depriving it of its dangerous influence.

1. The first fact on which the defence of the polytheistic character of patriarchal religion is accustomed to rely for support, is the form of the usual expression by which the Hebrew designated the idea " Godhead or God." This expression has a pluralistic form, for it reads *'elohîm*. On that fact Jahn bases himself in the first sentence of the book mentioned above, and reference is also made to it in

[1] E.g. Stade, *Biblische Theologie des A. T.* (1905), § 15 ; Marti, *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion* (1907) § 8 ; Kautzsch, *Biblische Theologie des A.T.* (1911), p. 13.

[2] In *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion* (1915), pp. 79–115.

[3] Gustav Jahn, *Ueber den Gottesbegriff der alten Hebräer und ihre Geschichtsschreibung* (1915).

the newest book on the theology of the Old Testament.[1] But while authors now frequently rely on the plural form of this expression in order that they may prove the polytheistic character of the earlier religion of Israel, the following things are overlooked.

The pluralistic form of *'elohîm* is in the first place only an abstract plural, which in its probable origin from *'alah*, corresponding to the Arabic *'áliha* (" to fear "), expresses the idea of " awe " ; and then, in accordance with the frequent use of the *abstractum pro concreto*, the idea of that which inspires awe in the highest degree, that is, " divinity." [2] There are in the Hebrew language many other abstract plurals, like that of which we have an example in *'elohîm*, e.g. *ballahôth*, " terribleness " and then " terror " (Ezekiel xxvi. 21, etc.), and note, in especial, that *'elohîm* does not differ in form from *be 'alîm*, " lordship=lord " (Isaiah i. 3, etc.). Indeed, the Hebrew language possesses more of such plural forms than other Semitic tongues. For in Hebrew " heaven " is denoted by the plural form *schamájim*, while the Arab uses a word in the singular (*samâ'un*).

The plural form *'elohîm*, in the second place, is sometimes used along with an adjective or verb in the plural. But this occurs only in cases where heathen worshippers speak of many gods, as e.g. the Philistines in 1 Samuel iv. 8, etc. The plural construction of *'elohîm*, we observe, is occasioned only by the form of the word, and is therefore only a *formal* matter. The clearest proof of this lies in the fact that even when *'elohîm* undoubtedly and by general admission refers only to a single divinity, the plural construction is none the less employed, as in the allusion to the golden calf (Exodus xxxii. 4), which is not thought of otherwise

[1] Knudson, *The Religious Teaching of the Old Testament* (1919), p. 79.

[2] The description " Herrschaftsplural " which Ges.-Kautzsch's Hebrew Grammar uses in § 124 possesses no authority whatever.

than as a single figure. It is regrettable that in many translations the quite impossible rendering, "These be thy gods, O Israel!" has been retained. The plural construction of *'elohîm* occurs, even when the reference is to the one "living God," as e.g. in "He (!) is the living God" (Jer. x. 10).

We note, in the third place, that while the expression *'elohîm* denotes here and there the plural "gods," as, for example, in the first commandment of the Decalogue, where the translation is correctly given,[1] "Thou shalt have no other gods before me," a later derivative use of that plural form is apparent. Is it not so, for instance, in the plural of extension *panîm*, "face"? This word also, in case of need, is used in the sense of "faces," as in "four faces" (Ezekiel i. 6, etc.). The genuinely plural use of *'elohîm* has many analogies in the *later* plural use of words which undoubtedly betokened in their original meaning an idea in the singular. But if *'elohîm* had from the first denoted the plurality "gods," its predominant meaning, "divinity," or "God," would have been quite inexplicable. Further light is thrown on the extensive use of the plural form *'elohîm* to denote a single great one, by the fact that the corresponding plural form *'ilâni*, in the Amarna letters (circa 1400 B.C.) expresses the idea "divinity," and is applied e.g. to a single king. Jahn and Knudson, I may remark, have taken no notice of this important discovery.

On all these grounds we may conclude that the plural form of the expression *'elohîm* is a matter of interest only for philologists, and has no bearing upon the history of religion. The peculiar form of the word cannot, then, serve as a support for the theory that the patriarchs had a polytheistic religion.

[1] Explained in full in my *Kommentar zum Deuteronomium* (1917) on v. 7.

2. Jahn puts forward, in the book already mentioned, a second alleged proof of that theory in the *proper names* which occur in the history of Israel. He remarks that the personal names of the Israelites include a great many names of heathen gods. But we may explain the appearance of the names of strange gods among the proper names of the Israelites, in the first place by the sad truth that there often occurred a falling away of parts of the Israelite nation to the worship of other gods, and that such Israelites may easily have introduced into the names of their children the titles of the gods or goddesses whom they worshipped. Therefore the personal names of Israel which contain the names of strange gods furnish, on that ground alone, no proof of the polytheism of those who adhered to the true religion of the race. *Secondly*, it is often a mere fancy that the name of a false god has been introduced into some Israelite proper name. Nothing of the kind was intended, for example, when the name Be'eljada ' was given to a son of David (1 Chron. xiv. 7). For the word Ba'al which the name contains has for its primary meaning the generic idea " lord " or " husband." Therefore it was easily possible that it should be transferred to the Eternal One, especially as He, according to the familiar language of imagery, was described as the husband of the people of Israel (Isaiah l. 1, etc.). Indeed, this use of the word Ba'al is expressly recorded as a fact. For when a time came in which by reason of the rapid decline of the religious fidelity of Israel, it was necessary to avoid all Adiaphora, all things which in the past had been regarded as non-essentials, the Lord proclaimed through His prophet, " Thou shalt call me Ishi [' my husband '] and shalt call me no more Baali [' my master '] " (Hosea ii. 16).

As the use of the titles of strange gods in the proper names of the Israelites affords no proof whatever of polytheism

in the people's true religion, the same thing may be said of the sentence which was current in the time of Jeremiah, "According to the number of thy cities are thy gods, O Juda!" which Jahn, in an earlier work on the Books of Ezra and Nehemiah (1909, p. 188) has printed as a Shibboleth. As if this saying (Jer. ii. 28) applied, firstly, to *all* periods of the history of Israel, and secondly to all branches of that people!

The prophet Jeremiah, who represented the true or legitimate religion of Israel, utters in that sentence a fearful reproach against the religiously *unfaithful* Israelites; and the true religion of Israel *continued to exist* even if, as in the time of Ahab and Jezebel, there were among the ten tribes only "seven thousand" (1 Kings xix. 18) who remained faithful. The failure to distinguish between the rightful religion of the Old Testament and the so-called popular religion in Israel is, without any question, the weakest point in most current interpretations of the history of Israel.

3. As the previously mentioned "supports" of the new theory as to the polytheistic character of the earlier religion of Israel have proved on closer examination to be rotten, the same thing applies to other material which has been brought forward recently in defence of this idea. For instance, in the saying of Genesis i. 26, "Let us make men," some of the newer authors have thought that they detected either an echo of ancient polytheism among the Hebrews, (e.g. Dillmann on this passage) or the reflexion of a polytheistic passage from Babylonian literature (e.g. Gunkel on this text).

But the Scriptural text which lies before us in that passage is very far from indicating certain polytheistic reminiscences of the writer. For he uses immediately afterwards in *v.* 27 the singular of the verb, and of the possessive

pronoun in reference to *'elohîm*, "God," when he writes, "And *'elohîm* created man in His image." The use of the plural precisely in the *first* person plural, "Let us make!" is most probably the mode of speech of one who is taking counsel with himself about a plan.[1] Is there any Babylonian model in existence for this form of expression, "Let us," etc.? In recent times, as we know, there has been a marked tendency among critics to assume that many passages of the Old Testament include elements borrowed from Babylonian thought, and in this passage on the creation of man they have fancied that at least an "unconscious remembrance" of a Babylonian text might have influenced the writer. But supposing that he did work upon a Babylonian original, with what astonishing completeness has he banished the swarm of gods and goddesses who meet us in the Babylonian creation-epos (line 10, etc.)! We could not sufficiently marvel at the skill with which he has transformed the mist of polytheism into the pure clear air of monotheism.

4. While no solid proofs can be established in favour of the existence of polytheism even at the earliest stage of Old Testament religion, the clearest testimony may be brought forward *against* this modern dogma.

For if there is *one* point which shines forth with brilliant clearness from the common content of the earliest sources, it is the fact that Abraham separated himself from his kindred on religious grounds, and in doing so marked off a new epoch in the history of human religion.

For at the very beginning of the patriarchal history we hear the Divine summons, "Get thee out of thy country and from thy kindred," etc. (Gen. xii. 1). With this positive utterance of the Jahvistic stratum of the Penta-

[1] All the various attempts at explanation are discussed in my Commentary on the passage.

teuch there corresponds the following too much neglected saying of the Elohistic stratum, which we find as an address of the Divine Being to Israel (Josh. xxiv. 2 f.), "Your fathers dwelt on the other side of the flood (i.e. the Euphrates) in old time, even Terah, the father of Abraham, and the father of Nachor, and they served other gods. And I took your father Abraham from the other side of the flood, and led him throughout all the land of Canaan."

As the above passage definitely proves that Terah worshipped various gods, while Abraham is named in distinct *contrast* in this matter to his father, other passages draw a similar distinction between the relatives of Abraham who had remained behind in Mesopotamia and Jacob. For Laban with his family are set before us as worshippers of various gods, when he complained that Rachel, in order to carry with her the protection of the household gods of her father, had robbed him of his gods (Gen. xxxi. 30). Jacob, on the contrary, in speaking of "the God of my father" (xxxi. 3*a*, 5*b*, etc.) refers to *another* object of his worship than the gods revered by his Mesopotamian relatives; and Laban says to Jacob and those belonging to him, "The God of your father" (v. 29).[1] Moreover, when Jacob returned to the homeland, he required of "his household and all that were with him," his family in the wider sense, that they should hand over to him the images of strange gods, and the various objects used for fortune-telling or magical arts, and he *buried them* (xxxv. 1–4 E.).

Finally we note that in the records of the transition from the period of the patriarchs to the time of Moses, nothing is said as to a plurality of gods worshipped by the fathers of Israel, and no repudiation of this or that god

[1] My *Geschichte der alttestamentlichen Religion* contains a critical examination of most of the old and new opinions on these passages (1915), p. 64 f.

is demanded. Everywhere we read of "the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob" (Exod. iii. 6 f., etc.), and it is precisely this portion of the traditions of Israel on which a recent historian, otherwise noted for his extreme scepticism, has remarked: "It cannot all have been pure imagination."[1] As this principle, which is common to all the sources of our knowledge on the pre-Mosaic age, was formulated as the first commandment of the Mosaic legislation (Exod. xx. 2 f.) the representatives of the true religion of Israel in later times knew no worse form of religious infidelity than the setting up of other gods beside the old God who had saved the race. Beside the vow of Joshua, "As for me and my house, we will serve the Lord" (Josh. xxiv. 15) we may set the words of Deborah's song, which declare that "in the places of drawing water," i.e. amidst the common business of the day, Israel "rehearsed the righteous acts of the Lord" (Judges v. 11); and Gideon's refusal to accept the place which belonged to the heavenly King of Israel (viii. 23). And as Eli gave up the ghost in sheer terror at the loss of the Ark of God, Elijah the Tishbite sprang into the conflict like a giant fully armed, when, as a result of the influence of the Phœnician-born princess Jezebel, her husband Ahab attempted to introduce the worship of Baal under official sanctions (1 Kings xvi. 31).

5. Since it can be proved so clearly that the modern view of the polytheistic character of the patriarchal religion, or of ancient Israel in general, rests on no evidence whatever, while much evidence can be brought forward against it, the thought naturally suggests itself, "Are there underlying reasons which account for the introduction of such a theory?" Reasons of that sort, I think, may be discovered. We shall find them partly in the method of

[1] Charles Piepenbring, *Histoire du peuple d'Israël*, p. 47: "Toutes ces traditions ne peuvent pas être tirées de l'air."

research, and partly in a general view of things which has obtained wide currency in our own time.

(1) As regards the method of research into the ancient historical books, it has unhappily become too much the custom in our "critical" age to examine only, or with rare exceptions, those parts of the sources which seem to yield evidence *against* the authority of these early writings. Yet the only *true* criticism is that impartial, all-round study which searches out with the same zeal passages in the sources which declare for the authority of tradition. That is why I have laboured for a number of years to collect and cast into the scales of scientific judgment all those portions of the early Hebrew literature which may be regarded as containing positive certainties for our belief, with the same fullness and accuracy which others have used in noting and discussing facts which seem to favour a different opinion.

(2) Then, again, scholars are too much accustomed at present to look away from the actual words of the text and seek to lay hold of pre-historic times. This practice of theirs may be bluntly described as a flight into empty space.[1] As this method oversteps inaccurately the limits of time, there is a third method, also much employed, which transcends the boundaries of space. For we find a marked tendency in some quarters to explain events described in the Old Testament writings from the supposed *milieu* in which they happened, i.e. to interpret them according to what was happening in the Semitic world in general, or in the general civilisation of antiquity. This method naturally presupposes that the true religion of Israel can have had no peculiar character of its own. Such an assumption would be the ruin of all true research into the history

[1] A criticism of its latest ingenuities of application may be found in my *Hermeneutik des Alten Testaments* (1916), pp. 134–136.

of civilisation. For unless the distinctive features of original narratives are observed and guarded, there will no longer be any need of sources, but we may construct for ourselves the course of history—as not a few recent writers have attempted to do in dealing with the religious history of Israel.

(3) These recent methods of research in the study of Israel's religious history are allied in the last resort with the general tendency of modern historical investigation inspired by Darwin, which may be observed in many works dealing with the Old Testament. According to this theory the development must have advanced from a lower to a higher stage, and even in the true religion of Israel no gleam of light may be discovered from the world beyond this earth. As a natural consequence the supporters of this principle are always inclined to look behind and above the text, in order to discover views which may be regarded as original, and they think that the true (patriarchal-Mosaic-prophetic) religion of Israel was derived from a so-called "popular religion." That religion which is treated in the sources as an aberration, is treated by them as of equal authority with the prophetic faith.

In the preceding article I have brought forward evidence enough to prove that this method of dealing with the sources is peculiarly unjustified in a treatment of the religion of the patriarchs. The burning problem of the hour in Old Testament "History of Religion" will find its solution when the Biblical account of the call of Abraham as the beginning of the history of redemption in Holy Scripture, is accepted as an authentic narrative.

Ed. König.

JOHN MacLEOD CAMPBELL:

The Development of his Thought.

II.

When MacLeod Campbell was deposed from the Ministry, being then aged 31, he had completed the first stage in the development of his thought. The position attained at this point in his pilgrimage was weakened by inherent contradictions and was, as a rational structure, untenable; but at the heart of it stood an impregnable truth. The strength of this man was the luminous certainty of his spiritual vision which discerned the eternal and universal love of God, and saw that love to be fulfilled, as a purpose of redemption, in Jesus Christ our Lord. This was the substance of the good confession which he witnessed before the Courts of his Church. The secret of it lay deeper than logic in the serene depths of religious faith. "All searchings of the heart," he said, "are superficial, which admit of a rest in anything else than a simple faith in God."

We have seen that he ascribed this primary step in his spiritual journey to the pressure of practical experience, to the thoughts that came to him as he sought for a message which might reach the souls of his people. But, as already suggested, the springs of his action lay deeper than this immediate motive, and are to be found, partly, in his early training. He indicates this in a letter written in his old age, wherein he says: "My early school was that of Tillotson, as embodied in my beloved father's teaching in the pulpit and out of it. My first conscious transition was from giving the first place to good works to giving that place to faith."[1] The "transition" of which he here speaks occurred evidently during his Row ministry, and the heresy case

[1] *Memorials*, II. 269.

was the result of it. It is clear, also, from this testimony that the effect of his father's teaching was partly to liberalise his habit of thought and partly to quicken his mind by way of reaction. To the same source, too, must be ascribed that fervour of religious feeling which inspired his evangelistic efforts, and so led to his theological activity. So that we must assign very great importance to the paternal influence as a means of his spiritual and intellectual endowment. But, while this is so, the utmost significance should be attached to Campbell's own witness that his theology was developed, in the beginning, in close relation to the work of a preacher and shepherd of souls, and was not the mere fruit of isolated study or of a narrow individual experience.

The second chapter in Campbell's theological history is concerned with his enquiries as to the *nature* of the Atonement. These enquiries began immediately after his condemnation and were continued until the publication of his great book nearly twenty-five years later. During all these years his mind kept recurring to this central theme; it was the background of all his meditation. He was, of course, far from being a man of one idea or of one interest; his letters abound in references to current literature and to the eminent men of his time, like Jowett, Arnold, Tennyson, Stanley, Manning, Newman, and Maurice whom he counted "the foremost man of his Church." He accomplished also a good deal of foreign travel; and the humanising influence of this upon his mind is indicated by a saying which occurs in a letter written in 1853, referring to his first journey to France: "A sense of the brotherhood of all men pervaded me, more than even the faith of the Atonement had up to that time awakened." Writing in 1870, he tells us that "Shakespeare had been for fifty years a formative influence in his life." He lived in relations of

friendship, too, with many people of position in the social, as well as in the intellectual world. Also, he maintained a warm interest in philosophy, and expressed, especially, high regard for his "young friend" Edward Caird and his school. We even hear of him reading Comte, "with more sympathy than he had anticipated." Nevertheless, his central concern was theology; and the main thing in theology was, for him, the problem of Reconciliation. Everything he read, as well as all the varied experiences of his days, seemed to shed light for him on some aspect of the Redeemer's work.

It is very important to note that during all the time that elapsed between his deposition and the completing of his famous book he was engaged in active pastoral service. Many people suppose that he withdrew into solitude after 1831, or, at least, into a life of learned leisure. Others, who know that he ministered in Glasgow for twenty-five years, regard this phase of his career with indifference. Yet, to the student of Campbell's teaching it is of the utmost moment to remember that, even as he wrought out his belief in the *universality* of the Atonement under the pressure of a laborious ministry, so he elaborated his far more profound doctrine regarding the *nature* of the Atonement while he toiled among simple people as preacher and servant of Christ. If we fail to hold this in mind we miss an invaluable clue to certain qualities in his master-book. It is of all great theological works, perhaps, the least academic. Spite of occasional formality of reasoning and abstractness of statement, it remains on the whole singularly close to experience and to the realities of life; in its treatment of the New Testament witness it avoids all minute textual discussion, and adheres to the broad lines of the Saviour's recorded ministry and the great principles of apostolic teaching. Above all, it is a profoundly religious book,

the work of one who possessed, indeed, acuteness of judgment and massive metaphysical power, but was especially learned in the things of the soul and in the ways of God with men. And these distinctive characteristics are doubtless due, in large measure, to continual contact with common Christian people, as well as to intimate communion with the God and Father of all.

MacLeod Campbell remarked at the close of his ministry that he had been a "nobody" in Glasgow. And certainly there is much that is pathetic as well as admirable in the record of his work in that city. Although he was able to hold the attention of many thousands in open-air speaking, and although as a preacher, especially in Gaelic, he sometimes attained heights of impassioned eloquence, his Chapel in Blackfriars Street did not attract large congregations; for Glasgow has never been very friendly to unauthorised religious ministries. Campbell's position, also, was one of painful isolation, partly because there was hardly any sect in Scotland at that time that would have welcomed him, and partly because he did not seek such welcome. He never believed in Congregationalism as an ecclesiastical system; and so was not an "Independent" in the usual sense, though he ministered independently and without salary. He differed from his friend Irving on many points; and so refused to join the Catholic Apostolic Society. He did not wholly sympathise with the Disruption movement of 1843,[1] though he liked and respected Chalmers; and he would not have joined the Free Church, even if its gates had been open to him. The only Communion that attracted him, except that of his fathers, was the Church of England, of which he once wrote: "It is the portion of the Church to which I turn with most comfort"; but he did not feel prepared to accept the thirty-nine Articles. He was thus,

[1] *Memorials*, I. 155.

in effect, a State Churchman practising non-conformity against his will. He felt that he had a vocation for preaching and pastoral work, and so he continued to declare his message to as many as would hear; but he claimed no position, called himself by no name, sought to found no sect, simply asserting his right to teach and to serve in the faith and the patience of Christ.

It is amusing to find Campbell, while still a minister in Glasgow, rebuking his friend Scott for employing in the pulpit a vocabulary too learned and academical. He adds, with some humour, that the character of his own audience had constrained him to acquire simplicity of diction. This statement is fitted to awake acute surprise, and even resentment, in the minds of those who have studied *The Nature of the Atonement*; for simplicity of diction is not a characteristic of that work. Dr. Denney remarks that MacLeod Campbell sometimes writes as badly as either Schleiermacher or Ritschl; and this is a criticism that is severe but just. Whatever Campbell may have learned from his pastoral labours, he did not learn lucidity of speech. Indeed, long passages in his book suffer from the evident fact that they have done duty as sermons. Nor was he left in ignorance of his literary failings; for his friends dealt faithfully with him in the matter. From Kilninver there came once the paternal remonstrance: "Man, you have a queer way of putting things." Indeed, his letters show him often in an attitude of apology as to this point. He complains that parts of his writings are said to be obscure which he wrote over and over again with the sole purpose of making them absolutely clear. He suggests, also, that the nature of his utterance is often due to the character of his thought. Thus, after remarking that he wishes he had the style of Froude, he adds: "But I do not feel that with the same thoughts to express he

could preserve the same ease and clearness." Nor can we deny that there is force in this defence. Lucidity of language is often gained at the expense of exactness in thinking; and Campbell's obscurity, like Butler's, is due in some measure to his extreme anxiety to state every idea in all its aspects and with all proper safeguards and qualifications. But, when every allowance has been made for this fine characteristic of his mind, it is still to be said that his style has caused his readers a deal of unnecessary toil. His periods are frequently long and formless, burdened with subordinate clauses; and they end at last without culminating. Not seldom a simple idea is hedged about with a thicket of words. Worst of all, the movement of his argument is not orderly nor clearly marked; and an important transition of thought is hidden away in an unobtrusive sentence in the midst of a heavy paragraph. Altogether, although his style has a massive strength of its own and is sometimes elevated and dignified, MacLeod Campbell is, on the whole, a great writer in spite of bad writing.

When we study *The Nature of the Atonement* we see how far its author has advanced beyond the position which he held at the time of his trial. With the patience of the man of science and the fervour of the saint, he has thought and lived and prayed his way to the heart of the Atonement, and he speaks as one who stands at the centre. He has, of course, surrendered nothing that was distinctive in his earlier testimony; but he has developed the inner logic of that teaching to its appointed end, reverently, carefully, but without fear. He rejects now the modified orthodoxy of his earlier period, which he condemns as less defensible than the older Calvinism. Moreover, he no longer accepts the penal view of the Saviour's Passion, nor does he admit that the category of mere suffering is adequate to the breadth and depth of Christ's propitiatory sacrifice. In

the past he had used the formula, "Christ died for every man," as a sufficient statement of His accomplishment; but now he regards the Cross as the culmination and perfecting of a redemptive mission which was the burden of all the Saviour's life, of all His thought and all His service. The Atonement has for its necessary basis the Incarnation: it is only as the Incarnate Son that Christ is able to enter into the being of God and also of man, and so to secure alike the satisfaction of the Divine requirements and the emancipation of mankind. The work of the Redeemer, thus regarded, has two sides: on one hand, He deals with man on behalf of God; on the other hand, He deals with God on behalf of man. As the representative of Deity He reveals the divine nature in its love toward the whole world and in its wrath against sin; and especially He makes clear the longing of the Father's heart for the recovery of His lost and wandering children. He also shows what God requires of men in order that He may receive them to Himself. This the Saviour does, in essence, by exhibiting in Himself that ideal manhood which is the desire of God, and, in circumstance, by definite precepts, by deeds of mercy and obedience, and by certain priestly acts which make known the law in its fulfilment. The things that God demands of us, as the means of our salvation, are a complete and perfect confession of sin and a correspondingly complete repentance: He asks these of humanity, not in any arbitrary way nor out of any legal necessity, but simply because nothing less than these can either satisfy the heart of the Heavenly Father or bring peace to the sinful soul. Nothing short of a confession that leaves nothing unsaid, and of a repentance that leaves no sin unrecognised and unforsaken, can secure a cloudless and intimate communion between the spirit of man and the Eternal Holiness. Such is the nature of things.

But, if an absolute confession and repentance are, thus, inevitably, the only means of man's reconciliation with God, the need and also the character of the Redeemer's work at once appear. It is not possible for men to compass either such a confession or such a repentance as is required by law and love divine. No sinner can so understand his sin as to tell it in all its meaning to the ear of the Father, nor has any guilty one the vision or the power to find and to follow the path that leads us Home. But that which is impossible for men is possible for Christ. The ideal humanity revealed in Him is able to satisfy the heart of God. He offers in our stead to the Father a perfect obedience, confession, repentance, intercession; and with this sacrifice God is well pleased. Nor does the truth of Christ's sinlessness render unreal or dramatic His priestly acts on our behalf; rather is it the essential condition of these. It is in virtue of His own spotlessness, His own unsullied humanity, that He is able to understand the whole horror and guilt of sin, and so to respond with a perfect Amen to the Divine judgment. This Amen of the Redeemer was expressed in His submission, in His prayers, in His sense of the burden of guilt which rested on His brethren, and, finally, in His endurance of the curse and shame of death. This filial homage of Christ, this perfect act of sustained and limitless sacrifice, has achieved an all-sufficient Atonement. There remains no longer any barrier between the soul and God. Christ "bore the sins of all men on His spirit," and "met the cry of these sins for judgment, and the wrath due to them," "absorbing and exhausting that divine wrath in that adequate confession and perfect response on the part of man which was possible only to the infinite and eternal righteousness in humanity."

This is but a bare outline of MacLeod Campbell's doctrine, designed merely to show how it completes the earlier

tendencies of his thought. I have not encumbered it with quotations, for the reason that Campbell is exceedingly difficult to quote except at great length. But, in order to suggest the atmosphere and power of the book, I venture to add here some characteristic sayings from it. They are arranged in groups to mark the different elements in the thought :—

(1)

" We may contemplate the mere capacity for redemption that was in humanity as a cry—a mute cry which still entered into the ear and heart of God " (p. 204).

Christ fulfilled " that hope for man which was in God antecedent to the Atonement, and which the Atonement has brought within the reach of our spirits " (p. 203).

" It is the cry of the child which reveals the mother's heart. It is the cry of Sonship in humanity which, being responded to by the Father, has revealed the Father's heart " (p. 203).

Christ's " faith in the deep yearnings of the Father's heart over man joined with His own conscious experience in humanity which testified that these yearnings could be satisfied " (p. 199).

" Loving the Father with all His heart and soul, and strength and mind, the Saviour loved His brethren as Himself " (p. 108).

Therefore, " the Son of God necessarily came under all our burdens, and especially our great burden of sin." (p. 109).

(2)

" ' No man cometh unto the Father but by the Son.' " All modification of this law is impossible, for Sonship and Fatherliness are mutually related in an eternal relationship " (p. 163).

The love of God to man " means that desire for man

which is fulfilled in the humanity of Christ and can in it alone be satisfied " (p. 147).

" That oneness of mind with the Father, which toward man took the form of condemnation of sin, would, in the Son's dealings with the Father in relation to our sin, take the form of a perfect confession of our sins " (p. 117).

" The Divine righteousness in Christ appearing on the part of man and in humanity, met the Divine righteousness in God condemning sin by the true and righteous confession of its sinfulness, uttered in humanity, and righteousness in God was satisfied " (p. 123).

(3)

" When I think of our Lord as tasting death it seems to me as if He alone had ever truly tasted death " (p. 258).

" As men in life know not life as God's gift, neither realise what it is to live, so neither do they in death know the withdrawal of God's gift, nor consciously realise what it is to die. . . . But it was altogether otherwise with our Lord. . . . The eternal life in which He passed through death enabled Him perfectly to taste of death—to taste of it as was only possible in the strength of eternal life."

" In substance, in spirit, He had all along said, Father, into Thy hands I commend My spirit. In actual death He now said so " (p. 250).

(4)

" We are as slow to see man in Christ as to see God in Christ " (p. 144).

" Holiness, truth, righteousness, love, must first dawn on us as confession of sin " (p. 154).

" The divine righteousness that is in Christ must be recognised as a higher gift than any benefit it can be supposed to purchase " (p. 133).

" Eternal life is . . . a light in which the mind of

fatherliness in the Father, and of sonship in the Son, are consciously apprehended and rejoiced in " (p. 148).

The publication of *The Nature of the Atonement* may be said to mark the fulfilment of MacLeod Campbell's theological development. It is true that till the end he continued to study hard and to write regularly, and that at the age of seventy he expressed the hope of yet giving to the world a " helpful " book. We must remember, also, that in the introduction to the second edition of his great work, ten years after the first issue, he gave to his doctrinal construction a final completeness and symmetry. Nevertheless the peculiar vocation of his life was really accomplished in 1856. The influence of circumstance and of natural fitness had directed his genius to the task of thinking out the problem of Redemption. To this high effort he devoted himself through years of obloquy and loneliness; and the fruit of his toil was one of the great achievements of the Christian mind: a supreme work alike of thought and of religion, a source of spiritual power that " with mild persistence " has continued to direct and shape the deeper belief and meditation of the Church. It was not to be expected that the mind which had completed so sublime a mission should be able to direct itself to new tasks or to work with equal splendour of power in alien fields of endeavour. It might, indeed, have been hoped that Campbell would have perfected the purely speculative side of his life-work by formulating his doctrine in its relation to ultimate destiny. This, however, he did not do. Enquiry as to the issue of things beyond the grave was not a matter to which he gave any very careful thought. But the tendency of his mind in later years was toward his friend Erskine's " theory of Universal Restitution, which commended itself to him incomparably more than that of

Annihilation," though he was not able to follow Erskine to the point of definite statement. " I still feel difficulties," he said.

MacLeod Campbell's labours in Glasgow were very great : during many years he preached three times each Sunday, and often every night of the week as well. And so there can be little wonder that he often broke down in health, or that in 1859 he was compelled to retire from pastoral service. It is significant of his attitude of mind that his congregation then dispersed and that most of its members joined the Barony Church, under the ministry of Norman MacLeod. But although he thus ceased to minister in Glasgow, he continued to reside in the district till 1868, when he returned to the shores of the Gareloch ; and there, amid the scenes of his early ministry, he died on February 27, 1872.

It is well to know that, before he left the western city, the ecclesiastical ostracism, which he had endured with such courage and sweetness of temper, was greatly relaxed. On the eve of his departure a presentation was made to him in the house of Edward Caird, and leading men of all the churches united to do him honour. Also, in 1870, he received from the University the degree of Doctor. This latter tribute he was glad to accept as in some measure a recognition of the truths for which he had suffered so much and laboured so long. It was part of the pathos which always attends advanced age that many of his dearest friends, like A. J. Scott and " beloved Thomas Erskine," had then departed this life ; and he sorely missed their presence on that day of tardy reparation which they had believed and longed to see.

It is unfortunate that the limits of a brief article do not permit us to discuss Campbell's *Letters*, which have never received their due place in the class of literature to which

they belong. They are not brilliant in diction, nor do they abound in epigrams and memorable sayings ; and a cursory reading of them leaves, perhaps, but small impression on the mind. But they repay a careful study with an increasing harvest of good. They are rich in shrewd criticism, thoughtful comment on men and things, loving insight into the meaning of nature and of human experience ; and, as we read, there gradually comes to us a *feeling* of the man who wrote them, as of an actual presence. It is a high and fine companionship, as of a wise, strong, gentle spirit, who suffered without bitterness, laboured without disillusionment, and lost, only to be the more enriched.

In a passage already referred to, MacLeod Campbell tells us that in his youth, under the influence of Tillotson, he set supreme value on good works, and that later he gave the chief place to faith. He adds : " My second and first thoughts are in my third and present, namely, the identity of goodness in the highest sense with faith in the highest sense—the identity, as a condition of the spirit, of being of the mind of Christ and of beholding the glory of God in Christ." It thus appears that he fulfilled, in the evolution of his beliefs, the philosophic process that moves from a positive position to its opposite, and then upwards to a richer reconciling unity. And such was indeed the process of his whole life. From the seaboard parishes of Kilninver and Row he went out to a strenuous life in the city ; and returned again in the evening of his days to the shores of the western seas. From the peace of his youth and of his opening ministry he passed forth into the midst of battle, calamity, and bitterness ; and he came back at last to a better quietude, wealthier in spiritual treasure, broader in vision, wiser, more secure. Finally, from the passionate, impulsive fervour of the earlier time he entered on a long season of that wearing, continuous service which chastens

enthusiasm into a habit of ordered obedience. And the end was as the beginning in ardour of spirit and intensity of belief, but with an added mellowness of thought, fairness of judgment, profoundness of experience and splendour of hope. "To me," he wrote almost at the last—"To me the waking consciousness of old age is sweeter far than the brightest dreams of early days."

J. H. Leckie.

PSALM LXII.

The sixty-second Psalm reads smoothly in English, but it contains some *cruces* in the Hebrew, particularly in the opening verses. Much turns on the interpretation of the apparently simple text of verses 1, 2 (2, 3 in Hebrew); indeed the right translation of this passage points, I believe, to a suitable historical occasion for the composition of this Psalm. Of the two *cruces* of verses 1, 2 we may say, *Hinc lucem.*

Verse 1 is rendered in R.V.,

> "My soul waiteth only upon God:
> From him cometh my salvation."

"Waiteth" represents the Hebrew דּוֹמִיָּה, which is taken by some authorities as equivalent to דּוּמָה, "silence" (Ps. xciv. 17). Thus Driver gives "Only unto God is my soul stillness"; so too Kirkpatrick with "silence" for "stillness." But MT has not satisfied commentators. Cheyne has remarked that the substantive דומיה taken in the sense of "silence" or "stillness" is not recognised by the Septuagint in any passage, neither in Psalm xxii. 3, xxxix. 3, lxii. 2, nor lxv. 2. Accordingly Cheyne, Briggs, and others prefer to read דּוֹמִי here, "Be all at rest, my soul, toward Elohim," conforming the passage in text to

verse 5. Against this it is to be said that LXX evidently read different Hebrew words in verses 1 and 5, for it gives *ὑποταγήσεται* in verse 1, but *ὑποτάγηθι* in verse 5. The reading דומיה thus receives some support from the Greek, but its meaning remains uncertain.

Again, verse 2*b* is rendered in R.V.,

> "He (Elohim) is my high tower;
> I shall not be greatly moved."

Surely something is wrong with the words, if they must be so translated. Can a man be moved at all, if God be his high tower? The Hebrew לא אמוט, "I shall not be moved," has an absolute sense: no attempt to qualify it is made in the remaining passages of the Psalter in which it occurs (ver. 6, *al.*). Moreover רבה is a doubtful adverb both here and in lxxxix. 8:[1] it must not be hastily taken as equivalent to רבת (construct). Accordingly Cheyne, Briggs, and others propose to omit the word as a gloss. This is an unfortunate suggestion, for as Duhm (*in loco*) points out, no reason can be shown why רבה should be inserted; it "glosses" nothing. Moreover LXX (*ἐπὶ πλεῖον*) acknowledges its presence in the Hebrew text.

With LXX in favour of דומיה (as against דמי) and in favour of the retention of רבה, it seems worth while to consider once more the interpretation to be put upon the two terms. Let us assume that דומיה stands not for דומה "silence," but for the proper name *Dumah*, and let us suppose that רבה is to be retained as an adjective, not an adverb. So the Psalm begins as follows:

CONFIDENCE IN GOD.

"Verily with ('towards') God, O Dumah, is my soul;
Of Him is my salvation.
Verily He is my rock and my salvation;
My high tower; I shall not be moved, O mighty foe!" (vers. 1, 2).

Dumah is an enemy of Israel, whether Edomite (Isa.

[1] "A terrible God in the assembly of the holy ones, O Rabbah."

xxi. 11) or Arabian (Gen. xxv. 14) is not quite clear. Rabbah also "the mighty one" must be, as the parallelism shows, an enemy, possibly the Ammonite, whose well-known capital was Rabbah (2 Sam. xi. 1, xii. 27). This parallelism of Dumah and Rabbah is a mutual confirmation of these two renderings. It is vain to object that the Psalmist *must* have used the unambiguous names "Edom" and "Ammon" in the case I am supposing, for a cryptic use of rarer proper names is characteristic of Hebrew, as of other, poetry. For a parallel it is sufficient to refer to Psalm cxx. 5,

"Woe is me that I sojourn in Meshech, that I dwell among the tents of Kedar."

But in spite of such obscurity as the names Dumah and Rabbah carry, it is possible and even reasonable to trace with their help an allusion to a situation very like that of the days of Nehemiah. In poetical diction *Dumah* and *Rabbah* may very well represent Geshem the Arabian and Tobiah the Ammonite (Neh. ii. 19).

Defiance of the Enemy.

"How long will ye set upon a man,
That ye may break him, all of you,
Like a bowing wall, a yielding fence?" (ver. 3).

In these words the enemies, already indicated by the names Dumah and Rabbah, are defied, confidently defied, by the Psalmist, who realises fully that his soul is safe, because it is "with God." It is to be noted that the enemy direct their attack against a particular "man," who occupies a position of "excellency," from which he addresses words of encouragement to the "people" (vers. 4, 5, 9=3, 4, 8 E.V.). May not the man be Nehemiah, whose coming to Jerusalem was resented by Sanballat and Tobiah (Neh. ii. 10), whom Geshem and Sanballat plotted to do mischief to (Neh. vi. 2), who in face of all dangers encouraged his

followers with the promise, "Our God shall fight for us" (Neh. iv. 20), and finally brought his plans to a successful issue?

THE DESIGNS OF THE ENEMY: THEIR TREACHERY.

"Verily they take counsel to thrust him from his excellency;
They delight in falsehood;
They bless when he speaks;[1]
But among themselves they curse him" (ver. 4).

Nehemiah's enemies were anxious to get him removed from his governorship, and made suggestions that he was disloyal to the Persian king (Neh. ii. 19, vi. 6). At the same time they represented themselves as friendly to him and as desirous to find a way for him out of a dangerous situation by "counsel" (Neh. vi. 2, 4, 7, 10–12). But though they "blessed" him, i.e. greeted him with professedly friendly messages and letters, yet among themselves they "cursed," i.e. reviled him and mocked at his building of the wall. Sanballat spake "before his brethren and the army of Samaria, What do these feeble Jews? . . . Will they revive the stones out of the heaps of rubbish, seeing that they are burned?" (Neh. iv. 2).

CONFIDENCE IN GOD REASSERTED: NO CONFIDENCE IN MAN.

"My soul, wait thou upon God only;
For of him is my expectation.
Verily he is my rock and my salvation;
My high tower; I shall not be moved.
With ('upon') God is my salvation and my glory;
The rock of my strength, my refuge, is in God.
Trust in him at all times, ye people;
Pour out before him your heart;
God is a refuge for us.
Verily men of low degree are a breath, and men of high degree are a lie;
In the balances they go up;
They are together lighter than a breath" (vers. 5–9).

The Psalmist is convinced that he has no help but in

[1] Lit., "into his mouth."

God. This is the very mind of Nehemiah. His watch-words are "my God,"—"The God of heaven,"—"The good hand of our God,"—"Our God shall fight for us" (Neh. ii. 18, 20, iv. 20). He breaks into prayer to "our God," and draws his people on to join in his petitions (Neh. iv. 4, 9). He has no confidence in men, for he has experienced the fickle weakness of the poor, and the oppressiveness of the rich (Neh. iv. 10 and v. 1–15). Further, he had marked that "the nobles" of Tekoa "put not their necks to the work of their lord" ("Lord" אדניהם; Neh. iii. 5). Certainly human help had failed him.

Warning to those that Trust in Riches.

"Trust not in oppression,
Nor breathe out your life in robbery;
Though riches be the fruit thereof, set not your mind thereon.
God hath spoken once;
Twice have I heard this;
That power belongeth unto God" (vers. 10, 11).

According to Briggs "the original Psalm reached its striking end in the words, "lighter than a breath," or (as he would render) "made of breath altogether." But (says Briggs) "in the times of Hebrew Wisdom" editors "added two gnomes." According to this view, verses 10, 11 have nothing to do with this Psalm. But, on the other hand, they have a great deal to do with the work of Nehemiah, and if the theory set forth in this essay be correct, these verses follow naturally on the previous context. Negatively Nehemiah found the "men of high degree" untrustworthy supporters in his work of re-organising the Jewish commonwealth. Positively he found them doing harm to the state, for they were creating hardship and discontent by their exactions from their poorer brethren. Their usury was helping to destroy the well-being of their countrymen. So Nehemiah addressed these men of high degree with words of stern reproof (Neh. v. 6–9). Do we not hear

an echo of this reproof in verses 10, 11 of this Psalm ? There is no power, the Psalmist concludes, in riches : power resides in God alone.

THE GOD OF POWER IS ALSO THE GOD OF KINDNESS.

" And to Thee, O Lord, belongeth kindness,
For Thou Thyself repayest a man according to his work " (ver. 12).

The Psalmist concludes by the confession that God who has the power, has also kindness to repay with good the man who does good. Is it a merely accidental coincidence that Nehemiah describes his God as one who keeps " the covenant and kindness " (Neh. i. 5) ? Is it mere coincidence that Nehemiah in his memoirs more than once looks for a Divine recompense for his labours, " Remember unto me, O my God, for good, all that I have done for this people " (Neh. v. 19 ; cf. xiii. 22, 31) ? Surely this last verse is inspired by the same spirit as the rest of the Psalm. A confidant of Nehemiah speaks here.

Two observations are made by way of postscript. The comparison of the hero of the Psalm to a wall-fence[1] which is to be thrust down may have been suggested to Nehemiah's secretary-confidant by the struggle over the rebuilding of the wall carried on so gallantly by the Jewish governor. In a sense Nehemiah himself was the wall of Jerusalem. Secondly, the term " ye people " (Heb. עַם) is not equivalent (*pace* Maurer) to the general term " homines." On the contrary it has special reference to the people over whom Nehemiah was governor. The rendering of LXX *πᾶσα συναγωγὴ λαοῦ* is right in sense, even if the reading which underlies it be inferior to MT, as Kirkpatrick and other authorities believe.

W. EMERY BARNES.

[1] גדר as in Ezra ix. 9.

"LOVE SPRINGS NO LEAK."

Among the praises of love sung by St. Paul in 1 Corinthians xiii. is this—(ἡ ἀγάπη) πάντα στέγει, which both A.V. and R.V. render "(love) beareth all things." That the Revisers kept this rendering in the text with some hesitation they show by giving "covereth" in the margin as an alternative. Their hesitation has been shared by many commentators, and springs from two causes. If πάντα στέγει means "beareth all things," how does it differ from πάντα ὑπομένει with which it is joined? And is στέγειν the word to express love's cheerful welcoming of hardships? Does it not rather suggest immunity from hurt? Face to face with these questions some interpreters have resorted to subtle distinctions between "bearing" and "enduring," while others have taken στέγει in a wholly different sense. Στέγειν is used of substances that do not allow themselves to be penetrated by air, light, fire, water, or other things. It is employed as a synonym for οὐκ ἐᾶν διαπίπτειν (or διεκπίπτειν or διαχωρεῖν or ὑπεκρεῖν); as opposed to διιέναι (transmittere), μεθιέναι, διακόπτειν. It is used especially of ships or bowls which do not leak, which are watertight, which do not let water run through, the fact that a ship must keep the water from running *in*, and a bowl from running *out* being immaterial. When, however, the verb στέγειν is applied figuratively to a person, it is perhaps invariably used in the "bowl" and not in the "ship" sense. So, while στέγειν used absolutely of a substance may mean "to be watertight" or "free from leak" in either way; when used absolutely of a person, it is almost sure to mean that he does not let what his mind has received run out. So with *instruction* in view Euripides writes—

> οὐκ ἂν δυναίμην μὴ στέγοντα πιμπλάναι,
> σοφοὺς ἐπαντλῶν ἀνδρὶ μὴ σοφῷ λόγους.
>
> (Quoted by Plutarch, ii. 502.

Such a man is, as Plato calls him, a sieve. What you tell him "goes in at one ear and out at the other." Nothing is retained. All leaks out.

Or, again, a man is said στέγειν who can keep a secret. Slaves are expected στέγειν τὰ δεσποτῶν (Euripides), and Lucian ("Navigium" 11, quoted by Wetstein) writes—

> μὴ γὰρ ὀκνηθῇς εἰπεῖν, εἰ μή τις ἐστι τῶν πάνυ
> ἀπορρήτων· καί τοι ἐτελέσθημεν, ὡς οἶσθα,
> καὶ στέγειν μεμαθήκαμεν.
>
> (Cp. Josephus, *Ant.* xix. 48.)

Thus we may say that στέγειν standing by itself is as sure to mean "word-tight" of persons as it is to mean "water-tight" of ships or bowls. And it is quite naturally used of *any* words that you would fain keep in, such as hasty, impulsive words, words that spring from and feed mere emotion and the like.

In the light cast on it by this brief survey ἡ ἀγάπη πάντα στέγει seems capable of meaning that love retains and cherishes every object brought within its reach; that it lets go no one whom it can keep near its heart; that Christian names, birthdays, conditions, hopes, fears, aims, dangers of all with whom it has had to do are in some way remembered; as well as the interests of communities, countries, and the Church. Or the words may mean that love is sure never to let get abroad secrets breathed into its ear or anything that for its high standard is a *tacendum*. Or, again, ἡ ἀγάπη πάντα στέγει may include the sense that at the bidding of love, of genuine unselfishness, many a word that we should like to speak will be held back; that love teaches reserve, reticence, restraint in speech.

Possibly this last sense is most in accord with St. Paul's use of the word elsewhere. Earlier in this Letter (ix. 12) he says that he refrained from exercising his undoubted right and from allowing the Christians of Corinth to exercise

their undoubted privilege of supporting him while ministering to them lest by so doing he should place a hindrance in the way of the Gospel of Christ, lest he should cause it to appear to the people of Corinth as one of many money-getting concerns. To express this refraining he uses the same words as he does of love, *πάντα στέγομεν*. Does he not mean "We put the utmost restraint upon our strong desire to urge the principle laid down by the Lord, and to give you the happiness of showing your devotion by carrying out that principle"? And in the First Epistle to the Thessalonians (iii. 1, 5)—the only other place where the word occurs in the New Testament—he says that it was when he could no longer "hold in," when his yearning to get into communication with the Church at Salonika would brook no more restraint, that he sent Timothy to them.

There is another question about the words *πάντα στέγει* affecting also those which follow, *πάντα πιστεύει, πάντα ἐλπίζει, πάντα ὑπομένει.*

Is *πάντα* an "object-accusative" or is it rather an accusative "belonging to the substantive notion involved in the verb," to give Madvig's mode of explaining such familiar constructions as *ἐμὲ μείζω βλάψετε*, "you will bring me *greater hurt*, do me *more harm*"? St. Paul uses *πάντα* so in Philippians iv. 13, *πάντα ἰσχύω*, "I have all strength," and certainly thrice in our Epistle, *πάντα ἐγκρατεύεται* (ix. 25), *πάντα πᾶσιν ἀρέσκω* (x. 33), and *πάντα μου μέμνησθε* (xi. 2). "Love practises all retentiveness, all trustfulness, all hopefulness, all patient waiting on God."

It is quite possible that *στέγει* is comprehensive, telling us that in all three ways, in cherishing all that concerns its objects, in keeping their secrets, and in holding in all words that would do hurt, love is sure never to "spring a leak."

G. H. Whitaker.

THE CALL AND THE COMMISSION OF JEREMIAH.

It is with unexhausted interest one turns to the brief and broken hints which the Old Testament offers as to how a prophet came to enter on his career and how he thought about his life-work. What the men effected was and is still so pregnant of influence on human religion, and so on all men count dear in their lives; the movement they initiated and continued is withal so unique a phenomenon in the world's thought and receives so little interpretation from outside analogies that we listen with greater eagerness to what they have to say about themselves and how they conceived the work which they were called to do. In particular, we turn to Jeremiah, both because he is so characteristic a prophet and because he has told more than the others of what determined him to become a prophet at all.

As soon as the subject is approached, the question arises as to the scope of the commission with which Jeremiah believed himself to be charged. It is true that this is stated with sufficient clearness in i. 5: "I appointed thee a prophet to the nations."[1] But the wide scope of the commission, its blunt and abrupt announcement and its supposed contrast with the view Amos is said to have taken of his visions as being concerned with Israel alone (i. 1) have combined to make the last words suspect to many. It must be acknowledged, however, that the suggestions offered do not commend themselves, since they are too patently efforts to escape from a text which has embarrassed the men who seek to emend it. Thus Stade proposed to alter "the nations" into "my nation,"[2]

[1] לַגּוֹיִם [2] לְגוֹיִי

and thus to bring the scope of Jeremiah's commission into agreement with what he believed to have been that of Amos. Unfortunately he failed to observe that Israel was thus described by a word which is elsewhere reserved for foreign, even for heathen, nations.[1] Duhm boldly strikes the word out as a late gloss, but in a fine comment full of insight makes one wonder what period and what circumstances produced so great a glossator. Study of the many glosses which have been added to Jeremiah's incisive words elsewhere does not increase a student's respect for these late scribes.

The Masoretic text gives no sign of having been tampered with, for none of the great versions departs from it. And when one looks again at Amos, with which the wider sphere of a prophet's commission is held to contrast so strongly, one finds that the description of his visions, as being concerned with Israel, is confined to the heading which no one would count of equal authority with the text, and that, by the irony of circumstance this limitation of the prophet's work is immediately followed by a series of oracles on foreign nations.

In these circumstances it may well appear warranted to look more closely into the nature of the prophet's call and see whether there may not be something there which agrees with and helps to confirm the wider view of his commission as one that was not limited to his own people. Even before discussing the prophet's call, however, it deserves notice that Jeremiah himself evidently did not limit the scope of the work of his predecessors to their own nation, and would never have written that heading

[1] The only two passages in which Israel is described as a גוי, not as עם, are Zeph. ii. 9, Ps. cvi. 5, but in both cases the word is parallel to another (עם and נחלה), and has evidently been deliberately admitted for the sake of variety.

to the book of Amos. He held a much larger conception of the prophetic function, for, when he was in strong opposition to Hananiah about the prospects of the rebellion against Babylon, he remarked (xxviii. 8), "There have been prophets before you and me, and they prophesied about mighty countries and about great kingdoms." The difference between himself and his opponent was not as to the scope of the prophetic commission, but as to its character, whether it foretold disaster or peace. Even his predecessors, Jeremiah seems to have believed, were able to see that the principles they held were valid for mankind. If they had been able to see so far, then to a generation like his own, which was more conscious of the unity of the world and of human destiny, it may well have become more patent that the rules which controlled that common destiny mocked at an accident like a frontier.

It is possible that so we may best interpret the other surprising feature in his call, the fact, viz., that he is described as having been called before his birth to the prophetic office. Duhm has another beautiful passage on the saying, in which he speaks of how a man, who held this conviction, was thereby delivered from half of the difficulties and half of the wasted efforts of the children of men. To a man who knew his work from the beginning life must have been of a singular and helpful simplicity. Unfortunately the comment ignores that Jeremiah was already a man, when he reached the conviction of having been set apart to one great task worthy of all his powers. It is before we become men that the wealth of life's offers and the powers of our untried youth tempt us to waste both on foolish experiments.

What does it rather mean to a *man* to reach the conviction that he was set apart to the work of God from his concep-

tion? Surely this, that what qualifies him for his life-task is his naked humanity. A man's nationality is decided by his birth; he is qualified to speak to his own people by the fact that he shares their life: the prophet to the nations is set apart for his calling, before he has been born into any nation. He does not represent the will of God for Israel alone—to do that, it were an advantage to be chosen, when he was a Jew: he represents the will of God for mankind—to do that, it is enough that he should be a man. His qualification corresponds to his message, and since his qualification is as wide as humanity, his message is for men.

Cornill has pointed out how the same correspondence between function and qualification appears in the Servant of the Lord songs in Deutero-Isaiah. The servant of Isaiah xlii. 6 describes his call and his commission: "I, Yahweh, have called thee in righteousness . . . have formed (יצר) thee and have given thee for . . . a light of nations." Even more definitely he brings the two ideas together xlix. 5: "Now, saith Yahweh, that formed (יצר) thee from the womb to be His servant . . . it is too light a thing for thee to be my servant to raise up the tribes of Israel. . . . I will also give thee for a light of nations, that My salvation may reach to the end of the earth." Here also the commission is to all humanity, and the qualification for fulfilling it is purely human. When one remembers how deeply Jeremiah's thought has influenced all the point of view in Deutero-Isaiah, it is difficult to believe that the correspondence here is accidental. The character of the call answers in each case to the scope of the commission, and both depend directly upon the greatness of Yahweh who, through call and commission alike, is about to fulfil His mighty purpose for the world. And, as men's thought of God grows, as His purpose is seen to be with and for all

humanity, so the commission of the prophet is recognised to be as wide as humanity, and qualification for his task becomes like his commission, broadly and profoundly human.

Because the scope of his commission was seen from the beginning to be so wide, Jeremiah hesitated to undertake it. Isaiah also had hesitated to undertake the similar duty when God called for servants of His will, but he hesitated on a different ground: "I am a man of unclean lips, and I dwell among a people of unclean lips." But Jeremiah believed that God had called him, had even set him apart for a special task to which he did not volunteer. Because he believed that God had called and equipped him personally, he dared not plead any such inward unfitness. For him to enter such a plea would have been to doubt the Divine wisdom in so selecting him. Rather it was the vastness of the task which appalled him as he faced it. It seemed impossible that, since he was but young, he could undertake such a far-reaching work. He received in answer no remission of its greatness, rather he received a renewed insistence on the character in it which had already made him shrink: "Say not, I am young, but unto all to whom I send thee thou shalt go and all that I command thee thou shalt utter." Here the R.V., following the Septuagint, has read אל for על in the first clause, and has rightly translated "to whomsoever I shall send thee." Everything tends to show that the reading על with the resultant translation "on whatsoever errand I shall send thee" is the feebler reading.[1] The latter rendering makes the two clauses "on whatsoever errand I send thee, thou shalt go" and "whatsoever I shall command thee thou shalt utter," mere tautology, which in the curt and close-

[1] Every student of Jeremiah knows how frequently the prepositions על and אל are confused in the book.

packed sentences of the chapter is very unlikely. What other errand had any prophet except to utter the things which Yahweh bade him speak? But further, if we interpret the clause "to whomsoever I shall send thee, thou shalt go," we see better the sense and the reference of the clause with which the next verse, v. 8, opens, "Be not afraid because of them." Who are the "they" of whom the prophet is commanded to have no fear? Surely those to whom he has been sent, the number and character of whom may well have dismayed him. Jeremiah has pleaded in natural timidity: how can he, who is but young and inexperienced, undertake so wide-stretching and so tremendous a commission? The inexorable Yahweh reiterates His command. The prophet is to go to all to whom his God gives him a message to deliver, and he is to utter the complete divine message, holding back nothing out of timidity or hesitation. "Only have no fear before them, for I am with thee to deliver thee." The hesitation and the command alike seem to call for the wider sense of the commission.

Hereupon Yahweh is said to have touched the prophet's mouth as the sign of how He has put His words into His servant's mouth. The connexion with what precedes is not hard to see. It is no commission of his own on which Jeremiah is sent, nor is the message he is called to deliver one of his own creation. What he has to utter is the word of Yahweh, which is operative of itself, which, when it goes forth from Him, cannot return void, but must accomplish His will. From this time forth the prophet is to utter that word, which may well, to him who believes he has it in charge, cause fear lest he fail to utter it, but the assured possession of which takes away all other fear. With this endowment the young prophet is endowed with an august and awful authority. He is not only a man apart, he is

one in authority,[1] because he is the bearer of Yahweh's words, judgments, valuations.

How wide does this authority extend, and to whom are these words of Yahweh to come? "I have set thee over the nations and over the kingdoms," to overturn and to build up. Naturally, Duhm, who is unable to suppose that Jeremiah could believe himself a prophet to the nations, rejects the whole verse which expresses the same idea in another form. He regards the verse as expressing a view of the function of prophecy or of the word of Yahweh, which is late and Messianic. One cannot help suspecting that Duhm really means late, because Messianic. He has made up his mind that Jeremiah's prophecy owed its origin entirely to the threatened invasion of Scythians. Naturally, therefore, the prophet cannot look for anything wider than such an external and casual event as an invasion is capable of suggesting to those who ponder it. But, to let that pass with a protest, in reality, this utterance says no more in substance than what is said of Jeremiah's activity in vi. 27 ff. There the prophet has it in charge to prove and try his own people's way, and what he rejects in Israel's life, Yahweh has already rejected. Yahweh there is coming to judge His people Israel: and the judgment is to be along the lines laid down by the prophet, in whose mouth are the divine verdict and valuation of all Israel's good. The judgment here is not different in character, it is only wider in its scope. Yahweh is coming to judge His world, and Jeremiah has it in charge to announce this coming, he has it even in charge to announce the terms of the dread approach, for the judgment which is to result

[1] The word used, הִפְקַדְתִּיךָ, is the one used of Joseph in Egypt, Gen. xxxix. 4. There it marks how Joseph is clothed with full authority, almost set in the position of viceroy in the kingdom.

is to be after his word, which is no less than the word of Yahweh Himself.

According to vi. 27 ff., Jeremiah can determine finally on the worth, and therefore on the fate of his own people: why not on the worth and the fate of all nations and kingdoms? Yahweh's tests are the same for all, even as Yahweh's power extends over them all. His test is the new valuation of life which the recognition of His will of perfect justice and perfect mercy brings into all human valuations, and these are human valuations, not the valuations practised by Israel alone in its moral blindness. Jeremiah has seen two commanding things. He has seen Yahweh a God of justice, and there is only one justice, not Israel's justice, nor Babylonia's justice, but human justice. He has also seen the world as it was. It is his function as a prophet to set up anew in the world the forgotten absolute standards. The standards are absolute, and as such, they determine the worth and decide the fate, not of one nation, but of all the nations. Because the standards, as absolute, are beyond national limits, he is called to set them up, not as man of Anathoth, not as Jew, but as man.

It is only when we deal as honestly as possible with the Masoretic text that we can see a consistent line running through the whole account of the prophet's call. As it stands, the record offers such a consistent thread. It may be valuable to follow the same course in the two accompanying visions, and try to determine their meaning in the hope that the account of the call and commission may throw some light on the visions, and that these in turn may help to make clear what is contained in the call and commission which appear as their preface.

The text of the first vision, that of the almond twig, presents no difficulty, except that its terms scarcely warrant

the charming picture of the young prophet having seen in the returning spring the fresh beauty of spring's first harbinger, the almond, and having drawn his oracle of hope from its appearance. For, to recognise a flowering almond when one sees it does not call for so great an effort of discernment that a prophet who had made it was likely to believe he heard Yahweh saying that he was right. The twig must have been a dry twig, or there is no point in the remark, "Thou hast seen right." But Yahweh continues how the very word שקד contains the assurance that He is watching intently over, already moving toward, the fulfilment of His word. But what is this word of Yahweh? And why should it be said specially to the prophet that Yahweh is already pressing on to fulfil it? It cannot merely be the general word of truth which He mercifully and constantly commits to the lips and lives of faithful men. In such a thought there is nothing which specially meets the case or is fitted to stay up the heart of the young prophet who is full of hesitation and fear. Indeed, there is nothing to meet the case of any prophet, since he, as prophet, is different from other men. If he was but one of the faithful, there was no need for Yahweh to set Jeremiah apart before his birth, to give him authority by touching his lips, to set His own words into his mouth. The word of Yahweh, which He declares His intention to fulfil, about which He says that He is already on the way to fulfil it, must be some word peculiar to the prophets, which indeed it was a great part of their function to utter. That Yahweh's word was always watched over by Him had no specific appropriateness in the peculiar position in which Jeremiah found himself.

One turns to the second vision, that of the boiling cauldron, in the hope that it may throw light on what has been left uncertain in the first. Here, unfortunately, the text is

not so clear, and in particular the crucial clause presents an unsatisfactory reading.[1] The R.V. renders the prophet's words: "I see a seething cauldron, and the face thereof is from the north." It cannot be said, however, that this is any more than a makeshift, for no one has ever succeeded in attaching any sense to the words. The effort has accordingly been made to remove the difficulty by a slight change in the second word,[2] which gives the sense that the face of the cauldron was turned to the north, as Ezekiel (ix. 2), in similar language, speaks of a gate turned northward. The meaning thus obtained is no doubt clear to those who have proposed the emendation, but to others it leaves the crux of the phrase untouched, viz., what is the face of a cauldron, how can it be turned anywhere, and what is the meaning or purpose of turning it toward the north. Duhm seeks to mitigate the difficulty by supposing that the pot was propped on three bricks (as it were), with an opening turned toward the north, through which fuel was introduced in order to stoke the fire. The suggestion has the merit of giving a reason for introducing the north, since the fuel is thus seen to come from the north: but it remains very hard to suppose that the open front of a fire could be called the front of a pot. One is driven to suspect that there is corruption in the word which describes the pot as having a face at all, and to suggest that some word derived from the Hebrew verb to blow, such as the blower or the fan,[3] has been corrupted into "its face." The reason for selecting a word derived from the root to blow is that in the following verse, *v.* 14, it has been found necessary to change the difficult phrase "evil shall be opened" into a reading suggested by the Septuagint and derived from the Hebrew

[1] וּפָנָיו מִפְּנֵי צָפוֹנָה.

[2] מִפְּנֵי or מָפְנֵי for מִפְּנֵי.

[3] E.g., מָפוּחַ bellows, which is used by Jeremiah in vi. 29.

word " to blow," and to translate " evil is being blown from the north."[1] With these emendations, we gain a clear sense : " I see a cauldron at boiling point, and the blower (or the bellows) is from the north. And Yahweh said unto me : Out of the north mischief is being blown against all the inhabitants of the earth."

Here " all the inhabitants of the earth " is far too wide a phrase to be interpreted merely of Palestine or of Judah ; and its frequent use, both in this prophecy and in other prophecies of the same character, shows clearly that no such limitation is here intended. Jeremiah is thinking about the world and, in particular, about Yahweh's relation to the world. With this agrees his mention of the north as the place from which the anticipated mischief is to come. Peake thinks of the Scythians, but so to think is to make far too much of that insignificant raid and to ignore how the north is described, long after the Scythians had passed into the oblivion they deserved, as the home and the source of all uncanny and malign forces.[2] Duhm seems right in recognising that the latter is the sense in which it is used here, and that " the inhabitants of the earth " means, not the people of Judah, but the inhabitants of the world. But, when he adds that, because the passage shows here an apocalyptic trait, it must be late, one must utterly disagree. Such a position is merely begging the question as to whether a world-judgment could enter the minds of the early prophets. In certain elements of the world-judgment the later men delighted : but the clear idea of a world-judgment, based on ethical valuations, was not alien to the mind even of Amos.

[1] Rothstein in B.H. reads תִּפַּח : I prefer תִּנָּפַח, since the pual of נפח is found in Ezek. xxi. 36 ; xxii. 20.

[2] Compare its frequent use in this wider sense in Jeremiah, and compare also Joel ii. 20, Isa. xiv. 13, Ps. xlviii. 2, Enoch lxxvii. 3.

The following verses, *vv.* 15, 16, present a curious and confused picture. At the beginning we have the nations of the north gathered and setting up their thrones in front of Jerusalem, and over against its walls.[1] The oracle then proceeds to state that Yahweh will pronounce judgment on "them." Who are meant by "them" is made clear by the catalogue of sins in the rest of the verse which describes the transgressions which have been committed by the inhabitants of Jerusalem. Evidently, therefore, the nations are not there in order to pronounce judgment on guilty Jerusalem ; Yahweh reserves the task of judgment in His own hands, *v.* 16. What, then, is the function of the nations in this connexion ? Either they are present to bear witness to the blackness of Judah's guilt and so to the justice of Yahweh's judgments, as Amos believed they might testify against the iniquities of Israel (iii. 9, 13); or they are present, in order to proceed to the siege of the capital and so to carry out the penalty involved in Yahweh's condemnation, should Jerusalem fail to profit by its God's warning and chastisement. But this explanation seems unlikely, because it is not clear that Jeremiah called for repentance in order to avert a calamity. He seems rather,

[1] Peake's interpretation of the passage seems definitely wrong. He takes the thrones which are to be set up to be thrones of judgment, and, since judgment was carried out in the gateway or in the open space inside the gate, he translates פֶּתַח "in the gateway." But כִּסֵּא would need some clearer definition, if it meant here a throne for judgment, undefined, it means simply a throne. פֶּתַח means "in front of," i.e., outside Jerusalem; cf. xix. 2 : "in the gate" would be בְּתוֹךְ ; cf. 2 Sam. iii. 27. And, finally, the function of judgment is definitely reserved, even in this brief oracle, to Yahweh. The seats of the nations, whatever they are meant for, are not meant for judgment. With this suggestion on his part falls Peake's further suggestion that the thrones of judgment are set up after the capture of Jerusalem has taken place, along with his half-hearted approval of Giesebrecht's rejection of the last two clauses of the verse, because they seem to imply that the siege has not yet taken place, but is still in prospect. We have not here a case of conquest carried out by the nations, and followed by judgment with the penalty which falls to be determined and inflicted on the guilty captives.

like Amos, to have construed his work as a prophet to be that of announcing a judgment which was sure to come, a judgment which might, after it had been experienced, work repentance, but which no present repentance would now turn back. In definite contrast to such an attitude of the prophet, the above interpretation seems to set the stage for a great drama of solemn warning through which Jerusalem might profitably learn to turn to its God and so avert its threatened doom.

But not only is it left uncertain as to what the function of the nations is conceived to be: it remains equally indefinite who these nations were. All who find it necessary to supply Jeremiah with a historical situation which accounts for his having the special message he delivered are in inevitable perplexity over the passage. Thus Duhm points out how the representation, since it speaks of several nations, cannot possibly refer to the Scythians, whether as instruments of judgment or as witnesses of the divine justice, for the Scythians are invariably described as one people. Nor can it be held to agree with the Babylonians of a later date, since, however composite that people was, it did not come out of the north, though it might be described as coming by way of the north. Peake, who holds by the historical situation, is in sore straits between the Scythians and the Babylonians.

But is the representation historical at all, or is it capable of being fitted into the frame of history? The whole conception is far more like the late idea of the nations being gathered before Jerusalem, sometimes to fight against the holy city, sometimes to be judged in its valleys. Only one must mark the difference between the two conceptions, as well as the likeness; and the difference is as well marked as the likeness. For there the nations are gathered to be judged, either through the world-war or through the world-

judgment, while Jerusalem is justified: here Jerusalem is to be judged, and the nations are gathered—for what purpose?

One cannot but notice something of the same indefiniteness in the picture of Joel iv. and in the Sibylline Oracles III. 67 f. There also it is not made clear what is to be the fate of the nations, or what is the exact reason for their being gathered at all. The only hint on the subject given by Joel is found in the title of the valley into which the nations are gathered: it is the valley of Jehoshaphat, or the judgment of Yahweh. But how the judgment is to be carried out, what precisely is the fate of the nations, why they should need to be gathered in order to be judged, what becomes of the nations after the judgment is complete, on all these questions not even a hint is given. The verses in Jeremiah belong to the time when such ideas were current, were indeed so current that it was not felt to be necessary to explain precisely what they meant. Had they belonged to Jeremiah, or had they appeared here for the first time from his own mouth, it would have been necessary to enter into clearer detail on the subject. But the verses are a later interpretation of the vision of the boiling pot, which has been added to our text. The fact that he was taking up current ideas from his own time made it natural that the interpolator did not feel the need to expound them or make clear their application to the prophecy. All that they contribute to our understanding of the vision of the cauldron is that this vision, in Judaism at the time when the verses were added, was interpreted in an apocalyptic sense. Men understood that mysterious and dreaded north, from which mischief was to come, as, not Assyria nor Scythia, nor any historic country with frontiers and kings, but the uncanny home of all the forces which fought against God's realm of light and order and peace.

In its original form, *vv.* 13 f., the oracle of the boiling pot, was as brief and as enigmatic and as suggestive as *vv.* 11 f., the kindred vision of the almond-twig. Remove the intruded verses, and at once the connexion is improved between the oracle of the boiling pot and the command to the prophet in *v.* 17. "Mischief is being blown abroad against all the inhabitants of the earth. Therefore gird up thy loins, arise, utter unto *them* all that I command thee . . . for I have made thee this day a city on its defence against the whole earth." To that verse it will be necessary to return.

Meantime, the two visions belong intimately together. The first follows directly on the saying of how Yahweh. has put His word into the prophet's mouth, and insists on how Yahweh is already rising up to bring to its fulfilment this, His word. It is the word which all the prophets asserted, which John the Baptist took up, which the last prophet in the Apocalypse reasserted, "Maranatha, the Lord is at hand." Jeremiah is not sent out into the world with the assurance that whatever he now feels driven to say is a word of the Lord. He is not in his vision asserting his claim to a measureless authority, as though the things he was now privileged to utter were *ipso facto* possessed of divine power. He is entering into the function of prophecy and taking up its perennial burden, that Yahweh is about to reveal Himself in and to His world, and that the issue of His self-revelation demands solemn thought from men. There is no reason to suppose that the vision must have been late in the prophet's life, and must have composed one of those additions to the supposed second edition of his prophecy which he dictated to Baruch. We do not need to believe that he had waited and waited in vain for the divine word to fulfil itself, before he required such an assurance as the vision brought. We do not need to

put it down to the time when he was opposed in Anathoth or persecuted in the temple, and when his fainting heart demanded some stay from his God. Already, when the young prophet began his career, Amos and Hosea, Micah and Isaiah had uttered their predictions of judgment, and yet to most men things might seem to have continued very much as they always were and are. The man, who is to take up their function and enter on his career, needs and receives an assurance of the certainty of that word of Yahweh which it will be his to utter.

That Jeremiah did believe there was some common burden of prophecy which it was his function to utter and did not conceive himself at liberty to go beyond it, seems clear from his attitude to Hananiah *c.* xxviii., and his saying, "There were prophets before you and me, and they all prophesied disaster." Evidently he believes that any prophecy which does not imply disaster needs some further verification, for he goes on to say as much. To him, with the thought he has of the righteous God, and the knowledge he has of God's purpose, the only immediate outcome of the divine emergence in this world of time must mean disaster to the world as it is. If we interpret his attitude thus, and can take it to be characteristic of all the prophets, does it not offer an interpretation of the mysterious "it"[1] with which Amos enforces all his prophecies against the nations round about Israel? Generally it is taken for granted that Amos keeps the phrase vague, as a large, awful, mysterious event hanging over the world. May it not be, on the other hand, that "it" marks to him something perfectly definite, the word of Yahweh which is committed to him as a prophet? Then, when he says that Yahweh will not turn it back any more, he means simply that the

[1] לֹא אֲשִׁיבֶנּוּ: "For three transgressions and for four I will not turn it back."

Lord is at hand, that Yahweh is about to intervene, not delaying, indeed, unable to delay longer.

So Jeremiah's second vision makes the matter clearer for him. Yahweh's word has been put into his mouth, and he has entered on the function of the prophet. This word is sure, since Yahweh watches over its fulfilment. And the word he is commissioned to announce is the old word: the day of the Lord is at hand. The cauldron is boiling in its place, and the blower is at work. Mischief is coming on the wings of the wind out of the mysterious north on all the inhabitants of the earth, and this is by the will of God. Yahweh is about to bring in His day which is now more clearly seen to be a day, not for Israel merely, but for the world which is His world, and which cannot escape out of His hands as it has sought to do. Israel had stood in the forefront when Amos uttered that message first, and the nations had been brought in as a kind of after-thought, because to them also the judgment of right must extend. Now the world stands in the forefront, because Yahweh is more clearly seen to be the God of the whole earth than Amos had seen. Israel still appears as the primary theatre of the divine judgment, because Israel has been more privileged than any other people, and because it merits, it shall receive the heavier penalty. But the judgment is for all the world, when the God of all the world rises up to make His will manifest.

In view of these things, the call, the commission, the visions with their content, what the prophet needs first and last is courage. "Let him take courage" (*v.* 17), "and have no fear before them," i.e., the inhabitants of the earth (*v.* 14). The commission is as wide as the world, and to a prophet, who sees this at the beginning of his activity, who does not come to see it at the close of his career, who

measures the wide implications of the thing he has undertaken, the primary need is courage.

Again, in *v.* 18, we have a turgid and unsatisfactory text. Even a glance can convince a careless reader how turgid its phrases are, compared with the noble severity of the preceding sentences. But only a student of Jeremiah will fully recognise how the verse is swollen with phrases which recur *ad nauseam* in the secondary sections of the book. A fenced city and a pillar of iron and a wall of brass are the sonorous phrases which are loved by the glossator. Probably the pillar of iron and the wall of brass are mere exposition borrowed, by way of heightening the effect, from xv. 20 by an unintelligent scribe—unintelligent, because he has not observed the fact that no one, as a matter of fact, ever does fight against an iron pillar. Probably the fenced town was the sufficient original. But further, the list of the kings of Judah and its princes and its priests and the commons is suspicious, because it too recurs so often in the edited reports of Jeremiah's speeches. Probably we should omit them all and simply read : " Lo, I have set thee, a town on its defence against all the earth (or, against all the peoples of the earth), and they shall fight against thee and shall not prevail, for I am with thee to deliver thee " (cf. *v.* 8).

The situation is that of an Old Testament Athanasius *contra mundum*. Jeremiah is the bearer of a word from Yahweh which all the world needs and which all men must sooner or later recognise in its terrible consequences. He is qualified for the task of being the bearer of such a word, through the fact that Yahweh Himself has chosen and set him apart as the instrument for a purpose of the Lord which is beyond local and temporal conditions. He bears it, therefore, not because he is born of the children of Abraham, nor because he is circumcised, nor because he

is of the kindred of the house of Eli, but because he is privileged to be in the secret of Yahweh, who is God of the whole earth. Since he bears this word with such a commission, he need not and must not fear any man, for the word, being of God, fulfils itself in the destiny of men.

It is scarcely necessary to do more than point out how intimately this construction of the prophet's call and commission explains and agrees with the feature of his spiritual loneliness which is indeed his distinguishing mark in the select company of the prophets. He was singularly human, less bound to home and kindred and nation by the tie of prejudice, but only more bound by the tie of natural, kindly, human affection. He loved the human things in Israel, the voice of the bridegroom and the voice of the bride, the sound of the millstone grinding the children's food, the kindly twinkle of the cotter's light after night-fall. Man, as man, with his human attachments, was very dear to him. Yet he walks alone across the stage of the history of time with almost none to understand what he meant or to bid him godspeed on his way. He was able to do it without growing sour or bitter, because he learned from the beginning that to the faithful and humble heart there is given a high fellowship, even the fellowship of Him who promised to be with him. So interpreted, the passage suggests the secret strength of a Greater than Jeremiah. "Ye shall leave me alone, and yet I am not alone, for the Father is with me."

ADAM C. WELCH.

THE APOLOGY OF QUADRATUS.

IT is generally agreed that the line of Christian Apologists, who constitute so large an element of the literature of the second century, is headed by the names of Quadratus and Aristides. Of these the first is said to have been a bishop,

and the second a philosopher; both of them hail from Athens; each of them is suspected of having presented the Defence of the Faith for which he is famous to the Emperor Hadrian on one of his visits to Athens, i.e. either in the year 125–6, or 129–130; but whether all of these traditional data or dates are verifiable must be considered doubtful; we can hardly accept them *en bloc* without close and careful scrutiny of the sources from which they are derived. Happily, we are much better placed than formerly as regards one of the Apologies in question. We have the Apology of Aristides in a Syriac dress, and in a Greek adaptation, and now comes the news of the recovery of an actual fragment of the Greek Aristides from the sands (fertile enough in this regard) of Oxyrhyncus. Quadratus still lurks, perhaps among the same rubbish heaps, and perhaps he also is robed in Syriac and waiting to be recognized, or lurking in the pages of Greek romance. It must often have stirred the inquisitive faculty of patristic students and ecclesiastical historians to hear that Aristides was found, and set them thinking and saying to themselves, "What about Quadratus?" Being one of the inquisitive band myself I think it may be useful to set down some of the directions in which the scholar's curiosity may occupy itself, until the time when the missing book shall come to light.

In the first place, then, we are to remind ourselves that practically all we know about Quadratus, and the single fragment that we possess of his work, comes from the pen of Eusebius. Jerome and others may repeat what Eusebius says, and may embellish his account, but experience tells us we are usually safe in disregarding Jerome when he is transcribing or translating Eusebius with amplifications; the added matter usually betrays itself as untrustworthy.

What, then, is the sum total of the Eusebian matter,

which must form one point of departure in any quest for the lost author? First of all, there is the statement in the *Chronicon* that Quadratus, a hearer of the Apostles, and Aristides presented apologetic appeals to Hadrian on behalf of the Christians, *or perhaps* on account of an edict (against the Christians).

So Eusebius couples the two Apologists together under the date 125 A.D. Next comes the passage in the *History*, with the famous quotation, as follows:

"To Hadrian Quadratus addressed and presents a discourse, having composed an Apology for our form of religion, because, you know, there were persons who were planning annoyance for our people. This Apology is still current among many of the brethren, and there is a copy in our own possession, from which one may see luminous evidence both of his intelligence and of his orthodoxy. And he himself discloses his personal antiquity, in the very terms of his own record, saying thus:

"'But the works of our Saviour were permanent (*ἀεὶ παρῆν*), for they were real; to wit, persons healed, those that rose from the dead, who were not only visible at the time of their resurrection, but were continuously present; not only during our Saviour's tarriance on earth, but after his removal they were here for a long time, so that some even came down to our days.'"

In reading these two Eusebian extracts, we must interpret *our own times* of Quadratus and not of Hadrian, nor of Eusebius; it will be natural for later writers to say that this means "to the time of Hadrian." We must also take the reference to the campaign of violence against *our people* in the same sense as *our times*, which means that the language of the *Chronicon* is also taken from Quadratus, so that we have really two quotations. Then we must observe further that when Eusebius speaks of Aristides' *Apology*

in similar terms to those which he uses of Quadratus, and says that, like the latter (*παραπλησίως τῷ Κοδράτῳ*), he addressed an apology to Hadrian (*ἀπολογίαν ἐπιφωνήσας Ἁδριανῷ*), the language seems to suggest that both *Apologies* were orally delivered in the first instance.

Where shall we turn next in our quest for further traces of Quadratus? Two suggestions have been made, one many years since, the other in quite recent times.

We are told by that omnivorous reader Photius,[1] that a certain Eusebius of Thessalonica, in the sixth century, had a controversy with a monk named Andreas, who employed against him words of Quadratus. Diligent search has not disclosed the existence, either of the arguments of Andreas, or of the ten books of Eusebius. The other direction in which it seems possible that the scent might be picked up by the hunter was the publication by De Boor of some fragments from the ecclesiastical history of Philip of Side.[2] These fragments have already become famous on account of a quotation from Papias to the effect that James and John were both of them martyred by the Jews, a statement which has been the cause of not a little controversy. Philip of Side also records from Papias that the mother of one Menahem was raised from the dead. He then goes on to say that "concerning those who were raised from the dead by Christ, *they lived till the time of Hadrian* (*ἕως Ἁδριανοῦ ἔζων*)." From the concurrence of this language with that of Quadratus, it has been inferred that Papias and Quadratus were dealing with a common tradition. We have already shown that the language of Quadratus "till our own days," was likely to be repeated in the form "until Hadrian," and so we infer that the sentence attributed to Papias is not from that writer, but the words "Quadratus says" have dropped from the text

[1] Cod. 162. [2] *Texte und Untersuchungen*, Vol. V.

of Philip of Side. So it does not seem that anything further is likely to be discovered in this direction. We must now cast our nets a little wider.

The conjunction which Eusebius makes between Quadratus and Aristides suggests to us that perhaps the former may be found in the lurking-place of the latter. We know that Aristides was the *pièce de résistance* in the long drawn out banquet of the story of Barlaam and Joasaph. We have also shown that for whole tracts of the famous treatise of Celsus against the Christians, we find him answering the statements and confuting the arguments of Aristides. Is it then possible that John of Damascus may also have looted Quadratus' *Apology*, or is there any connexion between Celsus and Quadratus ?

As far as relates to the great novel of John of Damascus, there is no *a priori* objection to the hypothesis that Quadratus might have been employed. We have called the *Apology* of Aristides his *pièce de résistance*, but it should be noted that he nibbles at it from his first pages, and he either knows it by heart or has it at his elbow when writing. Was Quadratus also on the *menu* ? Nothing more likely from one point of view ; there is plenty of apologetic matter scattered up and down in *Barlaam and Joasaph*. For example, there is the reply of the hermit to King Abenner (ii. 11) ; and there is the speech with which Joasaph converts Theudas from paganism to Christianity (xxxi. 285), to take the most striking cases. Each of these orations is an *Apology* as truly as the embedded Aristides. Take the former, which I quote from the recent excellent translation of Woodward and Mattingley. It begins this way :

" O King, if thou askest the cause how I came to despise things temporal, and to devote my whole self to the hope of things eternal, hearken unto me. In former days, when I was still but a stripling, I heard a certain good and whole-

some saying, which, by its force, took my soul by storm: and the remembrance of it, like some divine seed, being planted in my heart unmoved, was preserved ever until it took root, blossomed and bare that fruit that thou seest in me. Now the meaning of that sentence was this: It seemed good to the foolish to despise the things that are (*τῶν ὄντων*) as though they were not (*ὡς μὴ ὄντων*), and to cleave and cling to the things that are not as though they were. So he that hath never tasted the sweetness of the things that are, will not be able to understand the nature of the things that are not."

Evidently we have a philosophical inquiry before us, with *τὸ ὂν* and *τὸ μὴ ὄν*. And that we are dealing with genuine Apologetic matter, may be seen by comparing a passage from the *Oration* of Melito the Philosopher, addressed to Marcus Antoninus: [1]

"Truth, using the word as a stimulus and smiting such as are asleep, also awaketh them; and when they are awake, seeing the truth, they also understand, and hearing, they also *distinguish that which exists from that which doth not exist*. . . . But the folly of which I speak is this, if a man should leave that *which really exists* and serve that *which really does not exist: but there is that which really exists*, and is called God."

If we compare this oration, which is referred to the year 169 A.D., with our previous extract, we shall see that the line of argument is closely in agreement with what we find in the passage from the speech of the hermit: so we are justified in saying that the hermit is quoting a philosophic Apology of the second century. Is it possible that we have stumbled upon the wreckage of Quadratus? The opening of the hermit's speech suggests a parallelism with that of Aristides, each of them being introduced by an *ὦ βασιλεῦ*.

[1] Cureton: *Spic. Syr.*

We shall leave the suggestion on the table and see whether it acquires verisimilitude.

In the 17th chapter of *Barlaam and Joasaph*, we have the monk instructing the young prince in the elements of theology; he begins exactly as Aristides does, to argue from Creation to the Creator, and from the visible things to the eternal power. You would at once see, by reading the speech of Barlaam by the side of the *Apology* of Aristides, that we are dealing with matters philosophic and apologetic; you can almost hear the echo of "I, O king, by the grace of God came into this world, and when I had considered the heavens and the earth and the seas, and beheld the sun and the rest of the orderly creation, I was amazed at the orderly arrangement of the world: and I understood, etc."

Barlaam puts it in this way:

"Even as a man, beholding a house splendidly and skilfully builded, or a vessel fairly framed, taketh note of the builder or workman, and marvelleth thereat, even so, I that was fashioned out of nothing and brought into being, though I cannot see the maker and provider, yet from his harmonious and marvellous fashioning of me . . . have seen that I was not brought forth by chance, nor made of myself. . . . I thought upon the well-ordered structure and preservation of the whole creation. . . ."

Here, then, is another fragment of an Apology, or a fragment of another Apology. Is it part of Quadratus' work, or some other?

In the 31st chapter of the romance, Joasaph makes an oration to Theudas on the absurdity of idol worship, and the argument is easily seen to be on lines similar to those of the *Apology* of Aristides. Here, then, is a third Apology, or, counting Aristides, a fourth Apology embedded in the story of Barlaam and Joasaph. It cannot be regarded

as improbable that one of them should represent the lost Quadratus.

Now let us see if we can approach the subject from another angle of vision. I do not think it has ever been noticed that the author of *Barlaam and Joasaph* has made use, in the course of his story, of another Christian Romance, probably the first Christian novel ever written: I mean the *Clementine Recognitions*. If we compare the following passages in *Barlaam and Joasaph* with the opening of the Clementines, there will be no doubt of the dependence of one on the other.

The young prince uses the language of Clement: "He restlessly turned over all these things in his mind, pondering without end, and ever calling up remembrances of death. Wherefore trouble and despondence were his companions, and his grief knew no ease; for he said to himself, Is it true that death shall one day overtake me? And who is he that shall make mention of me after death, when time delivereth all things to forgetfulness? When dead, shall I dissolve into nothingness? Or is there life beyond, and another world?

"Ever fretting over these and the like considerations he waxed pale and wasted away" (*B. & J.*, v. 34).

Later in the story, Joasaph asks Barlaam the monk concerning a future life; he tells him that "much anxiety has fallen on my heart, and consumeth my flesh in pain and grief and fasteneth on my very bones. Shall we men, appointed to die, return to nothing, or is there some other life after our departure hence? These and kindred questions I have been longing to resolve."

The language shows that the romance is borrowing from the same source as before.

It might be said, What of that? unless you are trying to prove that there was a copy of the Clementine Homilies

in the library of the Monastery of St. Saba? It is clear that the language of these two passages is taken from the following noble opening of the *Clementine Romance*: "I, Clement, being a Roman citizen, even from my earliest youth was able to live chastely (σωφρόνως), my mind from my boyhood drawing away from the lust that was in me to dejection and distress.

"For I had a habit of reasoning, how originating I know not—making frequent cogitations concerning death: when I die, shall I neither exist, nor shall any one ever have any remembrance of me, while boundless time bears all things of all men into forgetfulness? and shall I then be without being or acquaintance with those who are; neither knowing nor being known, neither having been nor being? And has the world ever been made? And was there anything before it was made? For if it has been always, it shall also continue to be; but if it has been made, it shall also be dissolved. And after its dissolution shall there ever be anything again, unless, perhaps, silence and forgetfulness? Or perhaps something which it is not now possible to conceive? As I pondered without ceasing these and such like questions, I know not whence arising, I had such bitter grief that, becoming pale, I wasted away."

Evidently Joasaph is Clement. One does not need to write the passages down in Greek to see that they are the same.

Very good; but the question lies deeper than the possible proof of the existence of a copy of *Clementine Recognitions* at St. Saba. For when we reflect upon the matter, the Clementines are a more marvellous product than the story of Joasaph and Barlaam. Up to quite recent times, scholars have failed to notice that the body of the book was an old folk-tale, with which had been incorporated fragments from all quarters. In particular, a large part of the lost book of Bardaisan on the *Laws of Countries* is here pre-

served. No one has ever been able completely to unravel the threads of this story, perhaps no one ever will; but it is just as composite as *Barlaam and Joasaph*. We are going to suggest that the noble opening of the book is a piece of Christian Apologetic, in which the writer is speaking autobiographically. Its literary value is far beyond the rest of the book. The author began with a noble theft, the same method by which he transferred the splendid arguments of Bardaisan. But this is not Bardaisan: it is from some lost Christian writer, probably from one of the second century Apologists.

There is a curious coincidence between the story of Clement and that of the hermit in *Barlaam and Joasaph*. Clement begins with *τὴν πρώτην ἡλικίαν*, "my first years," and the hermit with *ἐν ἡμέραις ἀρχαίαις, ἔτι κομιδῇ νέος ὑπάρχων*, "in old time when still quite a lad." Is it possible that we are dealing with fragments of the same story? Does either of them, or both, come from the *Apology* of Quadratus?

When we read the *Homilies* carefully we see a great many passages that have the appearance of having been transplanted from the world of apologetic literature into the fairy-land of romance. Here also there are, as in Aristides, sketches of the *amours* of the Olympians, mixed with philosophic reflections upon the nature of the world and the Great First Cause. In the sixth Homily we pick up again an argument exactly like that of Aristides, that the four elements cannot themselves be God. Here are some passages:

"First, then, the four original elements cannot be God because they have a cause. Nor can that mixing be God, nor that compounding and generating . . . for the four elements, if they lay outside one another, could not have been so mixed together as to generate life without some great artificer. . . .

"Thus we are shut up to the supposition that there is an unbegotten artificer, who brought the elements together, if they were separate ; or if they were together, artistically blended them so as to generate life, and who, out of all produced one work. For it cannot be that a work which is completely wise can be made without a mind that is greater than itself. Nor will it do to say that Love is the Artificer of all things, or desire, or power, or any such thing. All these are liable to change and transient in their very nature. Nor can that be God which is moved by another, much less what is altered by time and nature and can be annihilated."

It is clear that the Clementines are just as much a piece of patchwork as the story of Barlaam and Joasaph ; in either case the novelist had a library at hand with which he was familiar, and from which he borrowed freely. It was not necessarily a Christian library in the exclusive sense, but it contained many Christian books. In either case, the collections were rich in Apologetic literature ; and if the passage which we quoted above does not come from an *Apology*, we cannot think of a source to which it can be referred.

Now let us return to the fragment of Quadratus preserved by Eusebius, and see if we can get any more light upon the book from which it is taken. It is clear from the terms of the extract that Quadratus is replying to some charge or objection ; the words, " But our Saviour's miracles were permanent, his healings permanent, the resurrected dead continued in life," require an antecedent. Some one has been suggesting that the miracles were phantasmal, transitory, a mere illusion of the moment. It is the charge of wizardry that Quadratus is refuting.

Now if we turn to Origen's reply to Celsus, we shall find him engaged in the very same task of refuting the charge

of magic, with the actual words of Celsus before him ; his method of reply is different from that of Quadratus. In the third century it was impossible to say that "the subjects of miraculous power lasted till my own days" ; and the force of the argument from persistence has been so weakened by the lapse of time that it is not available in the manner in which Quadratus presented it. Origen will take his own line, and ask whether the beneficent results of a Christianised world can possibly be the result of magicians and magic arts. But let us see how Celsus puts the emphasis on the magical explanation of miracles which he does not venture directly to deny. He begins by saying that Perseus and Amphion, and Aeacus and Minos, are credited by the Greeks with divine ancestry, and with works great and marvellous, beyond the power of man. He asks, why do not Christ and His followers show similar wonders ? Why did He not respond when His divinity was challenged in the temple and tell us plainly if He was the Christ ? To which Origen asks whether any of these Greek wonder-workers has left any luminous or beneficial result, that continues to after days (*παρατεῖναν εἰς τὰς ὕστερον γενεάς*).

This is a modification of Quadratus' manner of reply.

The whole world, says Origen, has the work of Jesus before it. But, says Celsus, suppose I grant you the truth of the healings or the resurrections or miraculous feeding of the multitude ; it was, in any case, nothing more than magicians do for a few pence in the market-place. They also drive out demons, expel diseases, call up the souls of heroes, set things in motion as if alive, which really are not alive, and so on.

I wonder, says Origen, slily, if this is the same Epicurean Celsus who once wrote a book against magic ! If, however, Celsus is prepared to concede the reality of magic, as an

explanation of our Lord's miracles, let him tell us of any magician who has reformed the world. Those who saw the wonders of Jesus underwent ethical transformation. Can Celsus produce the like? Is there any explanation possible except that God appeared in human form out of goodwill to our race?

It is clear, then, that wizardry (γοητεία) is one of the main arguments of Celsus, and, as we have seen, this is precisely what Quadratus is replying to in the famous quotation from his *Apology*. Then it is Celsus that Quadratus is replying to, just as it is Aristides whom Celsus is refuting. The result is very suggestive and interesting. We have the sequence

Aristides
Celsus
Quadratus.

We have also a good tradition for the belief that Aristides and Quadratus both presented their *Apologies* to Hadrian at Athens. In that case, we may take it, that the *True Word* of Celsus is the court reply to Aristides, and the Quadratus *Apology* is the summing up of the case for the Christians.

Here we are face to face with the chronological difficulty. It is not easy to make a definite statement as to the date of Aristides and his *Apology*; and as to Celsus, we are in a similar perplexity. Origen did not know accurately; what he did know was that Celsus was an Epicurean, but there were two such philosophers of the same name, one in the time of Nero, the other under Hadrian, and subsequently. Evidently it is the second Celsus that we are in search of.

From the fact that he is said to have lived under Hadrian, we are tempted to believe that this is the date of the *True Word;* but then there is the suspicious allusion to subsequent life and activity. It is generally held that Celsus

must be referring (in Orig. *c. Celsum*, ii. 9) to the expulsion of the Jews from their own land and city after the revolt under Bar Cochab, say after 135 A.D. It is not, however, clear that Celsus really refers to the great expulsion; it is perhaps only Origen's comment on their sufferings, and his proof that they got no more than their deserts. With Aristides the difficulty occurs in another form; as is well known, the Syriac version appears to refer the *Apology* to the time of Marcus Antoninus; but this raises the question whether his contemporary Quadratus would, as late as the time of Marcus Antoninus, have spoken of miraculous works as continuing their evidence to his own day. The problems of the chronology of the three writings requires, therefore, to be reconsidered. Our suggestion is that all these writings should be considered to be contemporary, and that a further investigation should be made as to the choice of emperors to whom the arguments are to be presented, and, if Hadrian is selected, a further decision is required as to the earlier or later date of the Hadrianic visits to Athens.

Here, for the present, we leave the matter; we have shown that there are a number of *Apologies* of the second century, which have been borrowed by Christian romances; amongst them may, perhaps, be found the relics of Quadratus. We had already proved, in the *editio princeps* of Aristides, that Celsus replied to Aristides, and we now venture the suggestion that Quadratus replies to Celsus, and that all three works belong to the same Athenian visit of either Hadrian or of Marcus Antoninus. That is as far as we have at present been able to pursue the search for the lost *Apology* of Quadratus.

Rendel Harris.

CAIN'S SACRIFICE: A NEW THEORY.

In a former article (The Expositor, July, 1915, pp. 1–23) I discussed some of the theories provoked by the very real difficulties presented to any close study of the story of Cain and Abel in Genesis iv. 1–16. I then drew the conclusion that the sacrifices of the two brothers really play a far more subordinate part in the story than commentators have commonly been willing to admit: that the story is more interested in the origin of communities and the attitude of Yahweh towards them than in the origin of sacrifice: and that in any case the narrative does not express the belief that sacrifice in general, or in particular sacrifice of animals, was traced back to any initial command of God. That not a few unsolved problems remained was also indicated. Since then a new theory has been put forward claiming to solve some of these problems and implying that, though what are commonly called the sacrifices of Cain and Abel, i.e., sacrifices of vegetables and slain beasts, were not offered at the direct command of God, a special type of sacrifice was so commanded. This theory starts from a point which I did not then consider, counting it irrelevant to the question of sacrifice, viz., that Cain was the first city-builder. Whether my judgement on this point was right, and if not, to what extent the new theory is right in the use it makes of this point, I now pass to consider; presuming this, that apart from its ingenuity the theory forms a convenient occasion for the consideration or reconsideration of certain important

questions relating to the Jewish theory and practice of sacrifice.

The theory which I propose to discuss was put forward by Professor Ehrenzweig of Graz in an article entitled *Kain und Lamech*; this appeared in the *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* in 1915 (pp. 1–11), but only became accessible in this country much later. Professor Ehrenzweig has recurred to the same subject in the current number of the same periodical (1919–20, pp. 65–86) in an article entitled *Biblische u. klassische Urgeschichte*. I will refer to these two articles respectively as i. and ii., adding the page references.

The theory in brief is this: Cain slew Abel as a ritual act; Abel was a sacrificial victim offered by Cain at the direct command of Yahweh—offered, however, not to Yahweh Himself, but to the demon of the place on which Cain erected the first city. Cain's sacrifice was thus a foundation sacrifice offered at the founding of the first human city; and the story, in its assumed original so different from its present much-mutilated form, was a cult-legend explaining why it is necessary to take a human life when a city or building is begun.

The starting-point of the theory is to be found in two statements in the present text of Genesis: "And Cain rose up against Abel his brother and slew him"; and "Cain . . . built a city." The two statements are not contiguous, and it requires some reconstructive skill to bring them into the close relation with one another which the theory demands. On the other hand, due weight must be given to the consideration that the city in question is the first city ever built, its builder the first human builder, and consequently here, if at all, in the midst of other stories of origins, the origin of foundation sacrifices should be explained. It may also be well to recall that the origin

of foundation sacrifice is only too likely to have called for and received explanation, for we have sufficiently clear evidence of the *practice* of this particular form of sacrifice in ancient Canaan.[1]

If, then, Cain was both fratricide and city-builder, it is not unreasonable to enquire whether his taking of human life and his building a city may have once been more intimately connected than they are in surviving forms of the story.

In his double character of fratricide and city-builder, Cain has a parallel in Romulus. This point did not escape earlier scholars, and was referred to by Fr. Lenormant in his *Origines de l'histoire d'après la Bible* (1880), in which he devoted a chapter (i. 143 ff.) to the association of fratricide with the beginnings of building. But on this Dr. Skinner's brief comment (*Genesis*, 116) might seem sufficient; having referred to the incongruity between Cain the city-builder and Cain the agriculturalist condemned to nomadism, he remarks: "Lenormant's examples of the mythical connexion of city-building with fratricide are not to the point; the difficulty is not that the first city was founded by a murderer, but that it was founded by a nomad." Of which remark I will only say at present that while Dr. Skinner puts his finger on the greater difficulty

[1] We no longer need to rely on the suggestiveness of the legends and folklore of many countries, nor to press the statement of 1 Kings xvi. 34, which some have sought to explain without reference to building sacrifices. Palestinian archæology has itself afforded evidence not to be explained away. The particular circumstances of burials under houses brought to light by the excavations at Gezer leave little room for doubt. But I have referred to this matter before in the EXPOSITOR (May, 1909, 432 f.), and it is unnecessary to go into the matter further here; but I may refer, e.g., to Driver, *Modern Research as Illustrating the Bible*, 69–72, 88. If 1 Kings xvi. 34 is in point at all, it is an instance (paralleled elsewhere) of a double building sacrifice—one life demanded at the beginning, another at the conclusion of a building. Ehrenzweig (ii. 69 f.) argues that Cain and Abel were another instance.

in the narrative of Genesis, he does not thereby necessarily deprive of significance the fact—if it be such—that in a narrative of the beginnings of things the same man appears to be at once the first taker of human life and the first builder. But something more was needed if Lenormant's suggestion was to claim more serious attention: this more Ehrenzweig has given, and in this more lies the novelty of his theory.

I pass first to an exposition of the theory with brief comments on certain points as they arise, reserving certain more general considerations till I have completed the exposition.

The story of Cain and Abel, it is suggested, as it lies before us, has been abbreviated and altered by the hand of one who had no sympathy with human sacrifice, and this revision has been so radical that any attempt to recover the original would be hopeless were it not that a parallel exists which fills in the gaps, and is in turn supplemented by the story of Cain. The method of reconstruction is familiar to readers of the works of Gunkel and his school.

The parallel, however, of which Ehrenzweig avails himself is drawn not from the newer discoveries of Babylon, but from the long familiar literatures of Greece and Rome; it is the story of Romulus and Remus and the founding of Rome. The Hebrew and the Roman stories are descended from common ancestors which Ehrenzweig (i. 3) was at first inclined to find in some Aegean legend carried, perhaps, by Arcadians to Rome, by Philistines to Palestine, and he found traces of the same motive elsewhere in Greek literature; e.g. Lykaon is distinguished as the founder of the most celebrated form of human sacrifice, though not of foundation sacrifice in particular, and also as the founder of the first city, whose foundation ranked as the type of that of all other cities (Pausanias 8. 38). In his more recent

article (ii. 65 f.), Ehrenzweig traces the two stories back to Babylon, arguing that the line of passage to Rome lay through Asia Minor and Delphi and that the method of transference was literary and learned. A Babylonian origin for the Hebrew story would have analogies enough for the hypothesis of such an origin to seem probable; and we may some day, as Lenormant long ago surmised that we should, discover a Babylonian Cain and Abel. But up to the present it remains unknown; and our expectation of discovering it may be qualified by the reflection that the Hebrew story is not only free, like other Hebrew parallels to Babylonian stories, from polytheistic associations, but in it the local Canaanite colouring is much stronger than in the stories of Creation and the Flood.[1]

The starting-point of the Roman and Hebrew legends would be on one interpretation of Genesis iv. 1 the same: for in this case Cain, like Romulus, would be sprung from a divine father—Romulus from Mars, and Cain from Yahweh. But this interpretation of Genesis is very dubious, and the filiation of Romulus to Mars scarcely belongs to the earliest form of the Roman story: it is certainly safest not to press the point.

[1] There is one particular feature in the Biblical story in which Lenormant detected a trace of a Babylonian origin; and though Ehrenzweig does not refer to this, and it has been disregarded by many recent writers, it is perhaps worth while to recall it. This is the use of רבץ in Gen. iv. 7. It has, says Lenormant, there and there alone in Hebrew the meaning *to lie in ambush, to lurk*, regularly employed in Arabic and often in Assyrian; and, moreover, *rabiṣu* is the Babylonian name of a special class of demons. This last remark is accurate; that the verb and root in Assyrian commonly had the sinister sense of the Arabic is questionable; as in Hebrew the meaning appearing in verb or noun is regularly that of lying down, especially with reference to cattle (e.g., *rubṣu* is a cattle-stall). Even the term for demon seems to have been neutral rather in itself sinister; for the *rabiṣu* is often defined as *limnu*, evil. A striking similarity to the רבץ לפתח of Gen. iv. 7 is the phrase occurring in the Ura myth (*Keilinschriftliche Bibl.*, vi. 60) *ra-bi-ṣu abulli-šu*, "the lurker at his door (in the blood of man and maiden)." If some Babylonian Cain and Abel story should be discovered we may reasonably anticipate that the *ra-bi-ṣu* will play a part in it.

The different occupations of the brothers, important in Genesis as explaining the difference in the initial offerings, has no clear analogy in the Roman story: Abel is a shepherd, Cain a tiller of the ground, whereas Romulus and Remus are both shepherds, though possibly a trace of the fratricide being an agriculturalist survives in the fact that Romulus used the plough in marking out the site of the city.

After a time (Gen. iv. 3) Cain and Abel brought offerings. Why? What had happened previously to make them do so? In Genesis there is a gap in the story which the Roman tradition fills up: the two brothers decide to build a city, but quarrel as to who is to rule it: it was this quarrel that lasted some time, and decided them to take the decision of the gods[1] of the place on which the city was to stand. This they did, מקץ ימים (Gen. iv. 3), *χρόνου δέ τινος ἐν τούτῳ διαγενομένου* (Dion. Hal. i. 86). If the Roman story fills up a gap in Genesis, Genesis in turn fills up a gap in the Roman legend, which, though it refers to offerings,[2] says nothing about the difference in the offerings of the two brothers. But the next point in the story is common to both traditions, and being very paradoxical is an indication of their common origin; in response to the offerings, the deity at first indicates a preference for the brother who is not ultimately called to rule the city: Yahweh regards Abel's sacrifice: to Remus there appear six vultures, whose preference for Remus is unexplained in the Roman tradition, but obtains an explanation from the Hebrew tradition, since the vultures would naturally make for Abel's bloody (cf. Gen. xv. 11), in preference to Cain's vegetable, offerings.

Cain and Romulus are alike annoyed at the preference shewn for Abel and Remus, but they are comforted; and

[1] So Livy, i. 6: in Genesis replaced by Yahweh.

[2] *προθύσαντες δὲ τοῖς θεοῖς ἱερὰ τὰ νομιζόμενα* (Dion. Hal. i. 86).

the main purpose of the legend should now be unfolded. Romulus now receives a more striking revelation than Remus had done, though of the same kind; *twelve* vultures appear to him. But the incident is left unexplained in the Roman tradition; in the Hebrew story the new revelation has become obscure, but retains traces of its original significance, which was none other than to ordain the institution of foundation sacrifice and to prescribe its ritual. Thus the new theory attempts a new explanation of the difficult 7th verse of Genesis iv.—a verse which has never yet received a wholly satisfactory explanation: I can only recall here that the verse, which has since Philo commonly been taken to refer to Cain's *moral* conduct—"If thou doest well (E.V.)—was understood by the translators of the LXX to refer to ritual—"If thou offerest correctly." The new theory returns to this most ancient interpretation of the verse on this point: the comforting speech to Cain on this view ran as follows: "If thou actest correctly," i.e., offerest sacrifices, like Abel's, that appeal to the appetite of the *numen* of the place, is not the supremacy,[1] viz. over your brother, (yours)? but if thou dost not act correctly, at the gate (of the city to be founded) sin [substituted for a term referring to the numen] lieth, and for thee will be its desire; but it is *thou*, not Abel, who art to rule over it, viz., the city." Certainly, if the clue offered by the new theory were good, it might explain some of the difficulties of the verse; e.g. the door or gate which has proved so troublesome to commentators, and the verb "rule over," which is much more suitable with the city as the object than with sin. Further, the assumption of deliberate mutilation of the original text in order to obscure the reference to the rite of foundation sacrifice furnishes a cause for some of the obscurity of the verse which all serious scholars have recognised, and which some, like Dr. Skinner, have

[1] תְּשׁוּקָה as in Gen. xlix. 3.

already been inclined to attribute to "deep-rooted textual corruption." "Every attempt," remarks Dr. Skinner, "to extract a meaning from the text is more or less of a *tour de force*": the new theory, if accepted, would explain why.

The mutilation of the Hebrew text in what follows has long been obvious. It reads: "And Cain said unto Abel his brother"—but what he said is no longer in the Hebrew text; it has dropped out accidentally, or has been deliberately omitted. It is commonly supposed, indeed, that the missing words are preserved in the LXX, and consisted of the insignificant invitation, "Let us go into the field." This, of course, is possible, but would be more convincing if the words supplied in the LXX were not so obviously a method of supplying a gap. The new theory holds that Cain's words to Abel were a statement of the new divine communication: as Romulus acquaints Remus with the fact that *twelve* vultures have appeared to him as against the six that had previously appeared to Remus, so Cain tells Abel that whereas God had seemed by His acceptance of Abel's sacrifice to designate him ruler of the city, He has since unmistakeably so designated Cain. Abel, like Remus, doubtless received this communication with scepticism: the brothers quarrel afresh, and the one takes the life of the other.

Romulus and Cain are alike seized with remorse, but what follows in the Hebrew tradition, viz., the curse on the fratricide, has no parallel in the Roman, and is really out of place in the Hebrew tradition, for it has no relation to the foundation of the city. The curse is due to the redactor, who no longer sees in Cain's act the pious discharge of a ritual duty, but merely a horrible crime. In this part of the story there are merely faint traces of the original legend, as for example the reference to the mouth of the earth receiving Abel's blood, in which we may see a parallel

to or explanation of the sacrificial pit or gutter for the reception of blood, the Arabic ghabghab, or the rock opening in the high place at Gezer, which, it has been surmised, was used for passing the blood of human sacrifice through to the cave below. The blood cries out ; its mouth should be gagged, in other words, the blood should be covered with earth—a detail which the Hebrew tradition omits, but the Roman supplies. Romulus's followers throw earth into the mysterious pit (mundus).[1]

The close of the story also receives a fresh interpretation : the stigmatisation by which Cain's life is guarded by a seven-fold sanction was not, in the assumed original form of the story, the amelioration of a punishment measured out to a murderer, but the reasonable and necessary protection of a priest or officiant who has carried out a sacred ritual act. Whoever takes a human life, even though for a ritual purpose, is in danger of the blood feud devolving on the relatives of the slain man : but the effect of the stigmatisation is to provide a counter security in the form of a more costly claim, if the life of the one who performs the sacrifice is taken ; for his life seven lives must be exacted, and the duty falls perhaps not merely on him, but on the whole people. That the stigmatisation is connected, so to speak, with a legal sanction has, it is claimed, a parallel in a Brazilian custom already noted by Frazer. " A man who had publicly executed a prisoner had to fast and lie in his hammock for three days, without setting foot on the ground; further, he had to make incisions in his breast, arms, and other parts of his body, and a black powder was rubbed into the wounds which left ineffaceable scars so artistically arranged that they presented the appearance of a tight-fitting garment. It was believed that he would die if he did not observe these rules and

[1] Plutarch, *Rom.* 10.

draw blood from his own body after slaughtering the captive."[1] In one important respect the parallel with Genesis is inexact. The Brazilian executioner does not mark himself as a security against traitorous men, and as security against being killed by them, but from fear of dying—and this probably, as Frazer suggests, at the hands of the executed man's ghost. Ehrenzweig glides lightly over this point not favourable to his purpose, but legitimately emphasises another point, viz., that in this parallel the marks are not for the protection of the ordinary murderer, as Frazer rather suggests, but for one who has performed a public and legal duty, and Ehrenzweig recalls Mommsen's claim in his *Römisches Strafrecht* that the oldest form of capital punishment corresponded to a sacrificial ritual, and that such punishment unquestionably once ranked as a case of human sacrifice. He also *infers* a parallel case of stigmatisation after human sacrifice from Lucian's record that the pilgrims to Hierapolis sacrificed their children coupled with the statement in the next chapter that the pilgrims to Hierapolis stigmatised themselves.[2] Further, in the song of Lamech Ehrenzweig finds a fragment of a liturgical text in which the priest recounts to the women who were not admitted actually to witness the rite of human sacrifice, how the rite had been duly performed by the sacrifice of a youth, and explains that any one avenging

[1] Frazer in *Anthropological Essays, presented to E. B. Taylor* (1907), p. 106.

[2] But the inference is very precarious: Lucian does not suggest that the stigmatisation was limited to offerers of human victims. He rather suggests, or, indeed, directly asserts, that stigmatisation was the wider custom. I cite the relevant sentences, italicising the significant 'some" and "all": "They adorn live victims with ribbons and throw them headlong down from the temple's entrance, and these naturally die after their fall; *some* actually throw their own children down, not as they do the cattle, but they sew them into sacks and toss them down, visiting them with curses and declaring that they are not their children, but are cows. They *all* stigmatise themselves . . . and so it comes to pass that *all* the Assyrians bear stigmata." Lucian, *De Dea Syria*, § 58 ff.

himself on the priest of this sacrificial centre is subject to a yet more awful sanction than that attached to Cain; not seven, but seventy-seven victims must atone for the life of any member of this priesthood. The same relation between two different rites of human sacrifice is found in North European culture: at Upsala, nine, at the Danish Hleidr ninety and nine human victims were offered. Of the offering of the seventy-seven human victims at one time, the Old Testament contains no further trace: on the other hand, the seven relatives of Saul who were "hung up unto Yahweh" by the *Amorites* in Gibeon may be regarded as a case of human sacrifice at a high place which, as we know, subsequently became a prominent place of sacrifice with the Jews. From the particularity with which the time of year is defined, it may even be surmised that the offering of seven human victims at Gibeon was a periodic expiatory rite performed at the beginning of barley harvest.

Thus, Ehrenzweig summarises in concluding: the entire 4th chapter of Genesis contains instruction in sacrifice, especially human sacrifice. The lowest form of sacrifice consists of vegetables; and for this Yahweh has no regard. Next in the scale stands animal sacrifice. Both these were instituted by man. But the highest form of sacrifice is human sacrifice, which was instituted by Yahweh Himself: He instituted it at the foundation of the first city as an appropriate foundation sacrifice to repel the demon at the gate of the city. Of the ritual of human sacrifice we learn that the pit for the reception of sacrificial blood and the protection of the priest by stigmatisation belong to it.

The ingenuity of this theory and its occasional suggestiveness, even though it should fail to establish itself, will be admitted. But how probable is it? The author

of it appears to base his case, and in any case he might best do so, on the combination of two considerations: (1) the identity of the first taker of human life and the builder of the first city; and (2) on the correspondence of the story of Cain to that of Romulus, and on the sufficiency of allusions, in the two stories taken together, to the association of the death of the brother with the foundation of the city. He appears to admit that neither of these considerations taken by itself would furnish a sufficient basis for the theory. But if this is so, even from the author's standpoint, the theory must appear to me precarious, because even the first of these two considerations, which would commonly have been allowed to be valid, is in reality very uncertain.

For, did ancient Hebrew tradition identify the fratricide and the builder of the first city? There can be no question that Cain was a fratricide, but was he a city-builder? No doubt the Massoretic text of Genesis iv. 17 asserts that he was. But was this asserted also in the original text? In considering a theory which assumes so much modification (in the existing text) of an earlier form of the record we must consider other possible modifications, which may prove fatal to the probability of the theory. The present pointed text of Genesis iv. 17, must be rendered: "And Cain knew his wife, and she conceived and bare Enoch. And he became a city-builder, and called the name of the city after his son's name Enoch. But, as Budde has pointed out, the claim for Cain of being the first city-builder turns entirely on the word בנו, *son's*: Cain is not expressed as the subject of the verb, "became a city-builder"; he is not the person last mentioned before the verb, and the analogy of similar notices leads us to expect, after the statement of Enoch's birth, something concerned not with his father but with himself. Budde, therefore, suggested that the word בנו, *son's*, was an addition to the text;

of two of the recent commentators on Genesis, one (Proksch) adopts this, the other (Skinner) feels that the difficulty of accounting for the present text is a serious difficulty. Proksch claims in support of the omission an alleged reading of the LXX: the words *τοῦ υἱοῦ* found in other Greek manuscripts is omitted in Grabe's collation of the Codex Cottonianus. This cannot, however, be regarded as substantial evidence of the original Greek text. But—a fact that seems to have been overlooked—Cain also gives place to Enoch as the city-builder, if we assume a merely orthographic modification of the Hebrew text; the older orthography of the 3rd sing. masc. suffix ֵנ— was ֹה— (cp. Driver, *Samuel xxxii.*; Ges.-Kautzsch, *Hebrew Grammar*, 91c): thus בנה stood in the earlier text instead of the present בנו. This בנה was understood by those who modified the orthography to be בִּנָּה, *his son's*. The original intended בֹּנֵהּ *its builder*. Budde's text, emended conjecturally, indeed, but so far as the sense obtained is concerned for weighty reasons, gives for the crucial sentence: "and he (i.e., Enoch) became a city-builder, and called the city after his own name, Enoch." The suggested reinterpretation of an earlier orthography gives: "And he (i.e., Enoch) became a city-builder. And the city was called Enoch after the name of its builder." In either case Enoch—not Cain—is the builder—the nomad's son and not the nomad himself.

If the direct statement in Genesis iv. 17, that Cain built a city, is merely a delusion, do there remain in iv. 2–16 sufficient indications, even when the story is brought into parallelism with the Romulus legend, that it was originally told to explain why a human sacrifice must be offered when a foundation is laid? In spite of certain at first sight remarkable features in the present text, there does not seem sufficient left to make out

a plausible case, if once the clue of a direct statement that Cain was the name both of the fratricide and the city-builder is shown to be untrustworthy: and in any case the particular form in which Ehrenzweig presents his theory seems to me open to objections—objections which would not hold so strongly against a modified form of the theory. Ehrenzweig apparently holds that the story of Cain offering up Abel as a foundation sacrifice lay before the author of the source in Genesis in *written* form. What he says (i. 2) is this: "The old cult-legend in both traditions (i.e., the Hebrew and the Roman) outlived the cult, and therefore precisely in the ritual particulars suffered the most serious (ärgsten) mutilations. In Rome it may have been gradually distorted in the course of long oral tradition.[1] In Palestine a priestly hand appears to have industriously transformed the record (Aufzeichnung) of the heathen cult-legend. Much has been simply struck out, such as the conversation between Cain and Abel (v. 8), much distorted and interpolated. The account lying before (Vorlage) the Yahwist, was only of any value to him as a historical record of the founder of the first city: its real purpose, to explain an old Canaanitish rite of human sacrifice, might not be given expression to." But there is a good deal in the present text that Ehrenzweig makes no attempt to explain, and is not easily to be explained on the hypothesis that the story in Genesis is a written legend merely altered, even though industriously, by a Jew violently out of sympathy with it. If this priestly editor was only interested in the record of the first city, why does he eliminate that point so completely from the main story? It would have been easy enough to retain

[1] But in his recent article (ii. 65) Ehrenzweig appears to recall this explanation in favour of direct *literary* influence of Babylon by way of Greece on Rome.

this feature while still eliminating the foundation sacrifice. There is no reason, for example, why the fact that the brothers quarrelled over the question of dominion should be suppressed. Or why, having eliminated the reference to the city so fully from the main story, does he tack on the statement about the building of it so unconnectedly as to give good ground for the theory that we have at v. 17 a break at least, if not a change of source? How, at present, is the consummation of Cain's marriage and the birth of his son related either to the foregoing story of the fatal quarrel with Abel, or to the following statement of the building of the city? In this respect another attempt to fill up the lacunæ (for lacunæ there certainly are) in iv. 2–16 has more, though I do not say enough, to say for itself: if the ground of quarrel and the point to be decided by the presentation of the offerings was not who was to rule over a city, but who was to marry the sister of Cain and Abel,[1] it is natural, after the elimination by death of the rival for her hand, to record the marriage of the successful survivor.

Of many details that are unfavourable to a theory of direct and immediate literary transformation of a Canaanitish written legend, I will refer to but a few. In an enquiry of this kind all that can even approach to cogency of proof is that phrases, words, ideas incongruous and unexplained in the current form of the narrative, should receive their explanation from the different form of narrative assumed to be its source. If they do not, the theory breaks down altogether, or must be so modified as to allow of more stages than one in the transformation of the original story; in this case let us say such a prolonged oral tradition as was at first assumed for the Roman, but was, and apparently still is, denied to the Hebrew, tradition.

[1] Cp. Expositor, July, 1915, 10 ff.

There is no adequate explanation, on the assumption that the original story is of a foundation sacrifice, of the difference in the initial sacrifices of Cain and Abel and of the different way in which they were received, nor of what probably lies behind that of the different occupations of the brothers: i.e., one of the main characteristics of the existing story finds much less illumination from the new hypothesis than from the recognition that the main interest of the story is in communities, with a preference for the pastoral over the agricultural clans. Again, these initial sacrifices are offered, according to Genesis, to Yahweh, not to the demon of the spot. But this cannot belong to the original heathen foundation story. Ehrenzweig is vague on this point; but he holds (p. 11) that at one stage in the history of the story it was Yahweh who directed Cain to make his human sacrifice to the demon of the place. Yet if there was such a stage, it is one intermediate between the original pagan Cannanite legend and the story in Genesis.

Much the most striking of the possible indications of an original foundation sacrifice legend lies in the reference to the door or gate (פתח) in v. 7; for in such a legend a reference to a gate is as natural as it is difficult of explanation in the current form of the story. "He laid the foundation thereof at the price of Abiram his firstborn, and set up the gates thereof (דלתיה) at the price of Segub his youngest son" is the record in Kings of what has been taken to be the record of a (double) building sacrifice. But even so, the present text would seem once again to be more than one remove from a clear story of appeasing the gate-demon by a human sacrifice. "If thou offerest correctly, is there not supremacy (for you)? but if thou dost not offer correctly, at the gate sin lieth and unto thee is its desire." Let us assume with Ehrenzweig that this is the right translation of the verse, and let us

admit as a reasonable demand of the theory that "sin" has been substituted for some term for the gate-demon, there is still much that is not really consistent with the foundation sacrifice. How awkwardly asymmetrical are the ultimate questions—supremacy for Cain over Abel, or the demon lying at the gate? instead of, as we might expect, supremacy or subordination, life or death, or the like. And further, the verb "lieth" is still inadequately explained. For surely, alike whether the right offering is made or not, the demon is there: the question is whether he is going to remain there or not, or whether he is going to be appeased or not. And again, if the right propitiation is not offered the result is something much worse than that the demon lies at the gate: in that event it springs at and kills the negligent builder: this must once have been expressed, if the story of Cain and Abel was originally a foundation story: but it is not expressed now, and yet the language of verse 7 is so obscure that it cannot well be explained as entirely due to such a priestly redactor as Ehrenzweig alone places between the written heathen legend and our present story. The words being at once inappropriate to the assumed original and obscure in their present setting, it is reasonable, if not necessary, to assume intervening stages in which the sharp clearness of the original phrase was gradually worn down into its present obscurity.

One further point: verse 8 is notoriously defective: "And Cain said unto his brother, and while they were in the field, Cain rose up and slew Abel." "The field" here is the open unfrequented country in contrast to the city, the place where crimes are most conveniently committed, since the assaulted or violated person calls in vain for help (2 Sam. xiv. 6; Deut. xxi. 1, xxii. 25–27); i.e. the scene is entirely appropriate to the story of a murder

committed *after* men had multiplied and cities had sprung up, and the phrase is merely one of the several indications that in its present form the story of Cain and Abel does not reflect a stage of history before any city had yet been built, and when the entire population of the world amounted only to four. But whereas the field or open country is an appropriate term for the scene of a murder, it is less appropriate for the scene of a foundation sacrifice, which must surely take place on the site of the city or its gate: where the demon or earth-spirit dwells, there must the blood be shed for him. Now it would not be difficult, it is true, to surmise that "in the field" has been substituted for "in the gate" or "in the place of the gate" or the like, if this gave a satisfactory result; but it does not: as it stands in the text of Genesis "in the field" is both unnecessary and unprepared for: unnecessary, for assuming that the old legend had "while they were in the gate" it would have been perfectly satisfactory for the assumed redactor simply to have omitted the clause; and unprepared for, for nothing has previously been said of their being in the field. Of course the case is different if we follow the LXX and read: "And Cain said to Abel, Let us go into the field, and while they were in the field": but on Ehrenzweig's view that is not what Cain either said or could have said, for he must contrive to kill Abel not "in the field," but on the city site. What he said was quite different, viz., that God had designated him to rule the city: consequently "in the field," which certainly requires explanation in the present Hebrew text, does not obtain such an explanation from the assumption of a foundation sacrifice story as its *immediate* source.

For the reasons which I have now indicated, and for others of a similar nature, I consider Ehrenzweig's theory of a heathen literary account of the origin of foundation sacrifices as

the immediate source of the story in Genesis of Cain murdering Abel not only insufficiently supported, but decidedly improbable. On the other hand, the position from which he starts is not overthrown merely by proving this particular part of his own theory improbable. What he says at the outset is this: "The fratricide Cain, according to Genesis iv. 17, founded the first city. The prevalent interpretation (Lehre) prefers to make him, the agriculturist, the ancestor of a nomadic people. The city-building is struck out. It is attributed to another Cain, or left alone as an ill-fitting supplementary (unpassende nachträgliche) notice. Such a proceeding is unjustified so long as the possibility exists of explaining the whole legend as a unity."

There is some force in these remarks; there is also some oversight of essential facts. For that Cain was the reputed or eponymous ancestor of a nomadic people is not properly described as resting on an alternative interpretation of Genesis iv.; on the other hand, it is a fact immediately attested by other statements: the Cain or Kain who, according to Numbers xxiv. 22, is to be wasted, the Kain whose individual members are Kenites, was, as a matter of fact, a nomadic people. It is possible no doubt to dispute the identity of Cain the fraticide and Cain the eponymous ancestor of the Kenites, and thus in another way than that which Ehrenzweig deprecates to destroy the unity of the legends relating to Cain. But this is rendered, to say the least, inadavisable, because the end of the Cain story in Genesis iv. much more naturally suggests Cain the nomadic people than, as the new theory would have it, Cain, a guild of priests who sacrificed human beings. For such a priesthood is not conveniently to be regarded as wanderers (נע ונד) in the earth (Gen. iv. 12), who must be sought far and wide by those who would find them, whereas this is pre-eminently fitting of a nomadic people.

In neglecting the independently-established connexion with Cain the nomadic people, the new theory simply fails to grapple with all the elements of its problem.

On the other hand, it may be admitted that much discussion of Cain has suffered from a similar incompleteness, through neglecting Cain the city-builder—*if such he was.*

I have indicated reasons for questioning whether indeed Cain, save through a late accident of text or punctuation, ever was a city-builder. But the new theory is a legitimate challenge to those who do not admit the cogency of those reasons, and I will therefore briefly indicate how the case seems to me to stand if we accept Cain the city-builder as being as ancient an element in legend as Cain the fratricide and Cain the nomadic people.

In this case we have three striking elements in the Cainite tradition incompletely fused, or, perhaps, we may better say partially decomposed from an earlier union. At present the city-building stands most isolated, and this element appears to have been embedded in a story of the earliest days of the human race, of the origin of human arts and crafts. The story of the fratricide betrays, in its present form, as distinct from its present connexion, a much later stage in history—a stage after men had multiplied so that there were relatively crowded thoroughfares as well as lonely tracts of open country; but it is of course the story of days already long past to the story-teller. The nomadic people Cain, on the other hand, were still existing at the time when the Old Testament records of them were written.

The story of the fratricide is contiguous in Genesis with the notice of the city-builder; but the story no longer itself clearly refers to city-building; on the other hand, this same story ends in a manner that associates it with nomadism. In other words, Cain the fratricide and Cain the nomad seem more closely united in surviving forms of the legends than

either of these with Cain the city-builder; at the same time there are elements even in the story of the fratricide, especially the reference to the danger at the door, which are not easily explained by either of the main motives, Cain the fratricide or Cain the nomad, but could be explained as a *remote* trace of Cain the city-builder appeasing the demon owning the site of his city. Any such connexion is, however, decidedly remote; and, if the association of city-building and fratricide create a presumption in favour of an early legend of foundation sacrifice, such a legend seems to have been much transformed, and especially to have passed through a form in which the interest shifted from explaining foundation sacrifice to explaining the character and customs of the nomadic peoples. Another effect of this transformation is that the relation of the nomad to the city-builder has become obscure.

In a word, it is doubtful whether Cain was a city-builder: if he was, a remote legend, no longer more than dimly discernible, may have related how he slew his brother as a sacrificial victim to secure the safety of himself and his city, and the firmness of its walls.

If this is so, a consideration of some interest follows: the prophetic writings of the seventh century show clearly that, owing probably to a recrudescence of the custom, human sacrifice of a particular type, the sacrificing of children to Moloch, was frequently practised by the Jews, and how fiercely it was opposed and condemned, especially by the prophets. Archæological evidence indicates that human sacrifice of another type—the foundation sacrifice—was at least occasionally practised in Canaan, and even by the Jews down to much the same period and later; if Genesis iv. is related to this custom, the present form of the story is the outcome of an opposition to this type of sacrifice. A similar but clearer monument of such a protest against earlier custom has

long been recognised in the story of Abraham's sacrifice of Isaac : this, correctly read, bears evidence to an earlier custom of human sacrifice being suppressed by substituting an animal for a human victim through the opposition of the developing ethical sense in Israel. The story of Cain and Abel and the story of the sacrifice of Isaac are both derived from the prophetic narratives of the Pentateuch, the former from J, the latter from E ; i.e., on the usual theory of the date of these sources, the story of Cain and Abel in its present literary setting is earlier than the story of Isaac. On the other hand, the motive of human sacrifice in it is much more obscure ; and if my argument as to the length of time required for the transformation of the story be sound, the opposition of the religion of Israel to human sacrifice, even in its more exceptional, but, perhaps, very deeply rooted, form of the foundation offering, is thrown proportionately further back. The higher conscience of Israel, even at an early period, passed from a toleration of these cruel rites to the most thorough-going intolerance ; the prophets of the seventh century assert that human sacrifice had never entered into the mind of Yahweh to command ; the writers of the ninth century refuse to allow even the record of such rites to sully their pages ; and these writers would probably represent the last in an already prolonged conflict with certain crueller practices of earlier religion.

G. Buchanan Gray.

THE GREEK ARTICLE AND THE DEITY OF CHRIST.

The objections to the real Deity of Jesus Christ have taken various forms (philosophical, historical, theological, exegetical, grammatical). There are those who will not

take Jesus as Lord of life and death because they cannot comprehend the mystery of the Incarnation and who refuse to admit the possibility of the union of God with man in the person of Jesus Christ. There are those who reject the historical evidence for the existence of Jesus and seek to explain the record of His life and death as myth and legend. There are those who say that Jesus lived and was the noblest of men, and was deified by Paul and John (or who ever wrote the Fourth Gospel) after the fashion of the Roman emperors. There are those who accept the New Testament writings as adequate interpretations of Christ and Christianity, but who say that Trinitarianism is a misinterpretation of the New Testament. Jesus was, indeed, the Son of God, but only in the sense that all believers are—greater in degree, to be sure, but not in kind.

And then the grammarians have had their say, *pro* and *con*, on this great subject. As early as 1798 Granville Sharp wrote a monograph on the subject entitled, "Remarks on the Uses of the Definitive Article in the Greek Text of the New Testament, Containing Many New Proofs of the Divinity of Christ, from Passages which are wrongly translated in the Common English Version." He laid down a "rule" (p. 3) which has become famous and the occasion of sharp contention, but which is still a sound and scientific principle: "When the copulative *καί* connects two nouns of the same case [viz., nouns (either substantive or adjective, or participle) of personal description respecting office, dignity, affinity, or connection, and attributes properties, or qualities, good or ill] if the article *ὁ*, or any of its cases, precedes the first of the said nouns or participles, and is not repeated before the second noun or participle, the latter always relates to the same person that is expressed or described by the first noun or participle: i.e., it denotes a farther description of the first-named person."

Now, it is not easy to lay down a universal principle of syntax, particularly in a language so rich and varied in significance as is the Greek. But, though Sharp's principle was attacked, he held to it, and affirms (p. 115) that, though he had examined several thousand examples of the type, "the apostle and high priest of our confession Jesus" [1] (Heb. iii. 1), he had never found an exception. He does not, however, claim (p. 6) that the principle applies to proper names or to the plural number. Proper names are definite without the article. Eliott (*Aids to Faith*, p. 462) says: "The rule is sound in principle, but in the case of proper names or quasi-proper names, cannot be safely pressed." But Sharp did not apply it to proper names. Middleton followed Sharp in an able discussion, "The Doctrine of the Greek Article Applied to the Criticism and Illustration of the New Testament, 1808." A few examples may suffice to show how the principle works. Take the common idiom, "the God and Father" [2] (Rom. xv. 6; 1 Cor. xv. 24; 2 Cor. i. 3; xi. 31; Gal. i. 4; Eph. v. 20; Phil. iv. 20; 1 Thess. i. 3; iii. 11, 13), all in Paul's Epistles, and add Rev. i. 6, and "the Lord and Father" (Jas. i. 27; iii. 9).

All this is plain sailing. Now take the precisely parallel idiom, "the Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ," [3] in 2 Peter (ii. 20; iii. 2). There is no dispute here that the author describes one and the same person by the two epithets with the one article. In 2 Peter i. 11, and iii. 18 the pronoun "our" [4] comes after "Lord," but that makes no difference in the idiom. It is "our Lord and Saviour," and it is so translated in the English versions. But we have precisely the same idiom in 2 Peter i. 1, "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ," [5] as the Canterbury Revision rightly has it and

[1] τὸν ἀπόστολον καὶ ἀρχιερέα τῆς ὁμολογίας ἡμῶν, Ἰησοῦν.
[2] θεὸς καὶ πατήρ. [3] ὁ κύριος καὶ σωτὴρ Ἰησοῦς Χριστός.
[4] ἡμῶν.
[5] τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ.

so Moffatt translates it. But the King James Version renders it "God and our Saviour Jesus Christ," while the American Standard Version reads, "our God and *the* Saviour Jesus Christ" (note the insertion of *the* not in the Greek text) after the marginal rendering of the Canterbury Revision. Now, why this confusion where the syntax is so simple? A strange timidity seized some of the translators in the Jerusalem Chamber that is reproduced by the American Committee. There is no hesitation in translating John i. 1 as the text has it. Why boggle over 2 Peter i. 1?

The explanation is to be found in Winer's Grammar (Thayer's Edition, p. 130); W. F. Moulton's (p. 162), where the author seeks by indirection to break the force of Granville Sharp's rule by saying that in 2 Peter i. 1 "there is not even a pronoun with σωτῆρος." That is true, but it is quite beside the point. There is no pronoun with σωτῆρος in 2 Peter i. 11, precisely the same idiom, where no one doubts the identity of "Lord and Saviour." Why refuse to apply the same rule to 2 Peter i. 1, that all admit, Winer included, to be true of 2 Peter i. 11? There is no escape from the logic of the Greek article in 2 Peter i. 1. The idiom compels the translation, "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ." One may agree or not with the author, but that is what he said and what he meant to say. The simple truth is that Winer's anti-Trinitarian prejudice overruled his grammatical rectitude in his remark about 2 Peter i. 1. The name of Winer was supreme in New Testament grammar for three generations, and his lapse from the plain path on this point is responsible for the confusion of the scholars in the English Versions on 2 Peter i. 1. But Schmiedel, in his revision of Winer (p. 158) frankly admitted Winer's error as to 2 Peter i. 1: "Grammar demands that one person is meant."

Winer really gives the matter away in his comment on

Titus ii. 13, where the Canterbury Version again has it right: "our great God and Saviour Jesus Christ." [1] There the King James Version and the American Standard Version have it: "the great God and our Saviour Jesus Christ." The American Committee here again are responsible for standing by the King James Version in the margin of the Canterbury Revision. Moffatt follows the King James Version, but adds "of" before "Saviour." Winer (Winer-Moulton, p. 162) attacks the Sharp rule in Titus ii. 13 by arguing that "the article is omitted before σωτῆρος, because this word is defined by the genitive ἡμῶν, and because the apposition *precedes* the proper name." But the apposition "precedes the proper name" in 2 Peter i. 1, 11; ii. 20; iii. 18; and in the same passages, except ii. 20, we have also ἡμῶν. The grammatical criticism is plain, and Winer knew it, for in a footnote he adds: "In the above remarks it was not my intention to deny that, in point of *grammar*, σωτῆρος may be regarded as a second predicate, jointly depending on the article τοῦ; but the dogmatic conviction derived from Paul's writings that this apostle cannot have called Christ *the great God* induced me to show that there is no grammatical obstacle to our taking the clause καὶ σωτ. . . . Χριστοῦ by itself, as referring to a second subject." In the text above the footnote Winer had said: "Considerations derived from Paul's system of doctrine lead me to believe that σωτῆρος is not a second predicate, co-ordinate with θεοῦ—Christ being first called ὁ μέγας θεός, and then σωτήρ." Here, then, Winer gives the whole case away, both about Titus ii. 13 and 2 Peter i. 1. The grammarian has nothing to do *per se* with the theology of the New Testament, as I have insisted in my grammar.[2] Wendland[3] challenged Winer on

[1] τοῦ μεγάλου θεοῦ καὶ σωτῆρος Ἰησοῦ Χριστοῦ (or Χριστοῦ Ἰησοῦ).

[2] *Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research*, p. 786. [3] *Zeitschrift f. Neutest. Wiss.*, V. 333 f.

Titus ii. 13, and considers it "an exegetical mistake" to find two persons in Paul's sentence. Moulton (*Prolegomena*, p. 84) cites papyri illustrations from the seventh century A.D. which "attest the translation 'our great God and Saviour' as current among Greek-speaking Christians." Moulton adds this pointed conclusion: "Familiarity with the everlasting apotheosis that flaunts itself in the papyri and inscriptions of Ptolemaic and Imperial times, lends strong support to Wendland's contention that Christians, from the latter part of 1 A.D. onward, deliberately annexed for their Divine Master the phraseology that was impiously arrogated to themselves by some of the worst of men."

It is plain, therefore, that Winer has exerted a pernicious influence, from the grammatical standpoint, on the interpretation of 2 Peter i. 1, and Titus ii. 13. Scholars who believed in the Deity of Christ have not wished to claim too much and to fly in the face of Winer, the great grammarian, for three generations. But Winer did not make out a sound case against Sharp's principle as applied to 2 Peter i. 1 and Titus ii. 13. Sharp stands vindicated after all the dust has settled. We must let these passages mean what they want to mean, regardless of our theories about the theology of the writers.

There is no solid grammatical reason for one to hesitate to translate 2 Peter i. 1 "our God and Saviour Jesus Christ," and Titus ii. 13 "our great God and Saviour Christ Jesus." It is true that thus we have two passages added to the side of the Trinitarian argument to make up for the loss of 1 Timothy iii. 16 and 1 John v. 7–8. Scholarship, real scholarship, seeks to find the truth. That is its reward. The Christian scholar finds the same joy in truth, and he is not uneasy that the foundations will be destroyed. It is interesting to note also that in Acts xx. 28 both the King James Version and the Canterbury Revision have

" the church of God which he purchased with his own blood," whereas the American Standard Version has " the church of the Lord " (so Moffatt). There the difference is a matter of text, not of the article. But the two oldest and best manuscripts (the Vatican and the Sinaitic) read " God," which is almost certainly right. There is a good deal more that can be said concerning the Greek article and the Deity of Christ, but enough has been said concerning the crucial passages to show the part that the article plays in the argument.

A word should be said concerning the use and non-use of the article in John i. 1, where a narrow path is safely followed by the author: " the Word was God."[1] If both God and Word were articular, they would be co-extensive and equally distributed and so interchangeable. But the separate personality of the Logos is affirmed by the construction used, and Sabellianism is denied. If God were articular and Logos non-articular, the affirmation would be that God was Logos, but not that the Logos was God. As it is, John asserts that in the Reincarnate state the Logos was God though the Father was greater than the Son. The Logos became flesh (i. 14), and not the Father. But the Incarnate Logos was really " God Only Begotten in the bosom of the Father " (i. 18, correct text).

In Romans ix. 5 the punctuation is in dispute, and the article plays no decisive part in the meaning. Westcott and Hort punctuate the sentence so as to make God in apposition with Christ, as do the English Versions. This punctuation makes Paul apply the word " God " to Christ, as we find it in John i. 1, and 2 Peter i. 1, and Titus ii. 13. In Colossians i. 16–17 Christ is the Creator of the universe.

A. T. Robertson.

[1] θεὸς ἦν ὁ λόγος.

A GREAT SCOTTISH PREACHER.

ST. PAUL'S question, "How shall they preach except they be sent?" is sometimes quoted in a sense so foreign to the mind of the writer that it is important not to mistake its meaning. He does not ask, How can a bishop exercise jurisdiction except he derive his office from the Pope? or, How can a clergyman administer the Sacraments except he be ordained by a bishop?—these are the thoughts of a later age; but, How shall they preach except they be sent—by God? This is why in our English Ordination Service the first question put to the candidate is, "Do you trust that you are inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take upon you this office and Ministration?" This is what makes a man a minister. The rite of ordination is the public recognition given by the community, acting through its officers, to the Divine call.

There is a tendency to-day to exalt the ministry of the sacraments above that of the Word; and to lay the accent in religion on certain symbolic rites and formulas which have come down to us from the past, and have been retained in the Churches. But the ministry of the Word comes before that of the sacraments, and is prior to it both in thought and in fact. Its function is two-fold: (1) to preach Christ—"How shall they hear without a preacher?"; and (2) to bring life in its entirety into relation with Him. For the complete life has no loose ends or ragged edges; it is a rational and ordered whole. Thus conceived there is no nobler work than that of the preacher. And "Who is sufficient for these things?" asks the Apostle. "Our sufficiency is of Christ," he answers; and he adds, "We are not as many which corrupt the Word of God, but as of

sincerity, but as of God, in the sight of God, speak we in Christ."

A Scotsman once told me that no Englishman had ever heard a sermon. On my objecting that most English churchgoers said that they groaned under the infliction of sermons, he insisted not only that no English congregation ever heard, but that no English preacher ever preached, a sermon: "either (he said) he reads an essay, or he talks nonsense; and neither of these is preaching." It was, perhaps, an over-statement; but there was sufficient truth in it to give it point. As a rule, a good English sermon is, if not an essay, at least of the essay type; while of the rest, all that so sound an Anglican as George Herbert can say is—

> "Do not grudge
> To pick out treasures from an earthen pot.
> The worst speak something good: if all want sense,
> God takes a text, and preacheth patience."

And, mortifying as it is to admit it, it is a fact that a village congregation in Scotland would resent such preaching as satisfies the so-called educated worshippers in our fashionable town churches here.

Among the great Scottish preachers of our generation no name ranks higher than that of the late Dr. Alexander Whyte; and to few men does Scottish religion owe a greater debt. Like so many eminent Scotsmen, he came of the people—the staple of the race. He began life as a hand-loom weaver; his indomitable energy and a natural love of letters enabled him to use to the full the advantages of the admirable Scottish parish school system; his schoolmaster and his minister lent him the helping hand which in Scotland is never wanting to "worth by poverty depressed"; and before he was twenty he found himself a student at the University of Aberdeen. A few years later he was able to follow the call of which he had been from the first conscious,

and was admitted first a probationer, then an ordained minister of the Church. Here was his place. No one had a larger first-hand knowledge of Scottish religious life—in the family, the workshop, the college, the ministry in its various shapes and under its various conditions. When he spoke of these things, he spoke from experience; while, if you would estimate his spiritual insight and sympathy, read that unique series, his *Bunyan Characters*. He knew the human heart as it is given to few to know it; and he entered into the deep things of God.

Outward recognition came in abundance: if you passed by St. George's when he was to preach you saw a queue of people waiting, often in the rain, for admittance. But he made little of the cheap success of a popular preacher, and he attached little value to a merely outward observance. "It is the rankest superstition (he says) to think that such going to church—unconvicted and unconverted—has anything to do with true religion"; but as this particular form of superstition is not commonly found among us in England, it is unnecessary to enlarge upon it. For his purpose was not to discourage church attendance.

> "Come to church twice a day as long as you are able. But twice a day put away some wickedness out of your heart and out of your life before you go home. Twice every Sabbath-day become more and more sensible of the danger and the evil of sin."

He preached the sinfulness of sin to a generation which had forgotten it. "Knowing the fear of the Lord, we persuade men." It is not matter for regret that the picture of a torturer God has faded from before us, "which I commanded it not," God says, "neither came it into my mind." It was neither true, nor did it deter from evil. But, if the reaction from it passes over into moral indifference, into blindness to that *species æternitatis* under which the things of time present themselves to those who think and feel, little has

been gained. Conviction of sin is the first condition of religion. That "the wages of sin is death," that "he that soweth unto his own flesh shall of the flesh reap corruption," that "he that doeth iniquity is the enemy of his own soul"—these are self-evident truths and truths of experience. We may shut our eyes; but no one who sincerely interrogates his own consciousness will question them. A teaching which ignores or obscures them is salt that has lost its savour; "it is fit neither for the land nor for the dunghill; men cast it out." One of the secrets of Whyte's power over souls was that he dwelt upon the sterner side of religion in an age whose prophets speak smooth things. He did not speak smooth things; it was not his nature to dissemble; the word which God put in his mouth, that he spoke.

What impressed those who were brought into contact with him was his massiveness of character. He would not ingratiate himself; he had not a trace of that insincerity which is perhaps the class sin of clergymen. He neither could nor would be all things to all men; he never said or did anything because it was desired or expected, no matter by whom, that he should say or do it. "With me it is a very small thing that I should be judged of you, or of man's judgment; but he that judgeth me is the Lord." He was uncompromising and tenacious; like Knox, he "never feared the face of men." This is why, had he been of the Episcopal Church, he would never have been a bishop. Many eminent Scotsmen would—no doubt to our (and their) profit. Dr. Rainy, e.g., would have been an archbishop and an excellent one. But there are diversities of gifts; and Whyte was built on other lines. His attitude in the Robertson Smith case was typical. Himself a Puritan by conviction and temperament, he withstood the Puritanism of his Church to the face "because it was to be blamed." Here in England we may recall the similar position taken up a few years ago

under similar circumstances by the venerable Professor Sanday. Such men are a light and an example. Happy is the Church which hath its quiver full of them! "They shall not be ashamed when they speak with their enemies in the gate."

I remember asking a distinguished colleague of Dr. Whyte's how it was that the Free—now the United Free—Church of Scotland, which at the time of the Disruption was sufficiently intolerant in the matter of what was then regarded as orthodoxy, had come to be the special *habitat* of Scottish liberal theology. His answer was that the same conscientiousness and loyalty to known truth which led the men of 1843 to go out, like Abraham, not knowing whither they went, had led their descendants to follow the same high call in the same high temper. The content of their message differed in form from that delivered by their fathers; but the source, the spirit and the direction were the same.

He meant by conviction of sin something more than a mechanical enumeration of sins of commission or omission, however many and great; the root of these transgressions is within, and it is good for us to see ourselves as we are, not as we appear to ourselves, or even to others. One of the many stories of which he was the centre illustrates this. A Highland minister came to Edinburgh to appeal for some good work in the North, and the Doctor gave him a list of some influential members of his Church to whom, he thought, he might apply. Among them was a "certain rich man" who received the appeal unsympathetically. The applicant was perhaps tactless; and the two came to words. "What do you take me for?" asked the man of means. "For a hell-deserving sinner, like myself," was the answer; and they parted on strained terms. When he heard of it, "Did you really tell him that?" asked the Doctor. "Aye," answered

the Highlander. "Well, well," said Whyte; "many's the time I've wanted to say it to him myself; here's five pounds." I think it is a good thing for us to remember that we are "hell-deserving sinners." For we are, though we do not picture hell as our fathers did; and when Heine said "*Dieu me pardonnera: c'est son métier*," he meant perhaps much what the Psalmist meant when he said, "He knoweth our frame." But it is a dangerous thing to forget our natural state. We cannot, indeed, think of it too often or too seriously, as long as we remember that forgiveness and access to the Father are offered to us in Christ. This is why the Name of Christ, in Bunyan's phrase, "spangles" in the eyes of sinners—i.e., in yours and mine. It is a free, an open, and an abiding offer; we may accept it here and now.

His wide reading gave a certain glow and colour to his preaching; a golden thread of reference, allusion, and association ran through it. And, though he wished the pulpit to be open to all who (as he put it) "had had a conversion, and were having a sanctification, and knew the English Bible, and had, like Bunyan, a passion for fruitful preaching," he would have a learned clergy. "Where it can be got, I would like (he says) to see a deep and broad and firm foundation of classical and philosophical learning laid in every minister's mind." And lack of scholarship, he insisted, "must not be due to laziness"; laziness in students and ministers was (he held) "the one unpardonable sin." "I would have all lazy students drummed out of the college, and all lazy ministers out of the Assembly. All the Churches will have to do this soon, if they are to live and thrive in this hard-working world of ours." Is not this a more effectual remedy for the decline of religion, which is, unfortunately, so characteristic of our generation, than most which we hear proposed?

He had a refreshing vein of humour and common-sense. I remember a sermon on Eutychus, the young man who, when Paul was long preaching at Troas, fell asleep—and fell out of the window. He imagined the Apostle discoursing first on this, then on that, point of abstract divinity; when he had mentioned one peculiarly uninteresting subject of this kind he leaned over the pulpit: "It was at this point (he said) that Eutychus fell asleep."

In his last years he recalled the old man Kephalos, in the Republic. He was a uniquely venerable, dignified and peaceful figure. When one visited him, one came away stronger, better and saner than one went. He spoke little; but what he said was weighty; experience, character, wisdom came out in his words. He retained his interest in men and ideas and affairs; but he seemed to see them, as it were, from a certain distance. He was nearer eternity than time.

The land that for us "is very far off" had become, for him, near.

God seemed to have raised him up to be a link between two orders; he interpreted the new to the old, and (what was almost as important) the old to the new. Such interpretation is the distinctive need of transition periods—in which it is essential, if we would judge rightly, to go below the surface; to consider not so much the words as the realities which underlie them. For these are what matter. Words pass; realities remain. In this respect it is difficult to overrate his service to religion. He facilitated an inevitable change of outlook and perspective. His formulas are not always ours; there is perhaps loss as well as gain in this; and the Puritan theology which he loved so well, and from which he derived so much, which was "profitable for reproof, for correction, for instruction which is in righteousness," has now rather a historical than an actual

interest. For "God fulfils Himself in many ways"; and the past, though it makes the present and the future, does not, as past, return. But of such men as Whyte it must be said—

Quasi cursores vitat lampada tradunt.

They hand on the torch which lights the passing generations of men to an eternal and divine destiny; they "guard the fire within." The form, the content, the connotation of religion, vary;

"Creeds pass, rites change, no altar standeth whole."

But religion does not vary: its roots lie deep in the nature of things, of man and of God. So deep that it is our first and most real interest.

"Not that your age excel
In pride of life the ages of your sires,
But that ye think clear, feel deep, bear fruit well,
The Friend of man desires."

ALFRED FAWKES.

THE AUSTERITIES OF DISCIPLESHIP TO JESUS CHRIST.

(MATTHEW X. 34 ff.)

THESE are among the most difficult of the Sayings of Jesus for apprehension in mind and conduct; and largely so because we have made them to be such. Their sternness will remain after that we have recovered their first meanings; but their interpretative difficulties will have dropped away. It is in the matter of these latter difficulties that the Pelion of exegetical effort has been piled upon the Ossa of institutional presupposition. For Asceticism, either in full or partial acceptance, has controlled the minds of the commentators when, through the centuries, they have turned to explain the Sayings which speak of separation from a

man's relations and of bearing the cross that Jesus Christ might be followed. Since it is noticeable that most of the commentators, after the Reformation and down to our own times, who would deny Asceticism as an institution, have kept the idea of Asceticism as they formed the factors of the solitary life and the cross-bearing into the Ethic of the Narrow Way. There have been also certain tendencies in critical scholarship to impress an ascetic strain in the figure and thought of the Jesus Christ of the Gospels. There would be few to-day, perhaps, who would hold the older notion that He was an Essene ; but there are many more who would hold that He was an ascetic, but of no peculiar type—a view of the sort held, for instance, by Professor von Dobschütz. The most careful discrimination is needed in this matter ; for, if Jesus was an ascetic, then there is the supreme sanction for Asceticism. This important matter, however, with its consequences for the Christian view of the Person and Work of Jesus Christ, must be here put aside ; though a new study of the Sayings in Matthew x. 34 ff. can be a contribution to the whole subject.

It is always a matter of great interest to study the Patristic commentators on any problem of interpretation, for where it is a question of exegesis, though they may not be correct, they may have preserved like gold in the unwanted quartz the line of most ancient handling of the problem ; or, better still, hints of the actual first meanings. They do not disappoint in the present quest. Their succession stretches from Origen to Isho'dad—an ample space in which to lose the most precious meanings, since prime connotations are almost as volatile as life in delicate organisms. Origen already seems to have lost them. His comments, so far as they are preserved, may be classed as being of the ordinary evangelical type. He apparently teaches renunciation so that sin might be refrained from for the sake of

Christ ;[1] and his belief is that the sword of Jesus Christ will bring peace to those who receive Him.[2] To arrive at that opinion, Origen contrasts the Lukan narrative of the Birth, where the angels sing how the Christ has come with "peace on the earth." These comments have a familiar ring. They are re-caught, for example, in Isho'dad of Merv. Indeed, his interpretation of the sword Christ came to bring[3] looks as if he had the commentaries of Origen to hand when he was writing his own, so much alike in sentiment are the two commentators. But when he takes up the Sayings concerning the separation from a disciple's relations and says: "The fathers would be divided against their sons because they believed not in Christ, and sons should contend with their fathers because they have left the religion of their fathers," he is as one who is trying to recall all that he has heard concerning the first meanings of the words, but there are some too elusive for him. It would seem that the sharp point of the most distinctive of these meanings had eluded him. Augustine of Hippo has kept a hint of what Origen had lost and Isho'dad almost remembered. It is in his short book, *Quæstionam Septemdecim in Ev. Matt.*[4] His opening comments on Matthew x. 34–36 are not illuminating. Renunciation is towards the evil one. The separation of the disciple from his mother is treated as if it were a parabolic notion representing the people of God in contrast with human society, that now has the name Babylon, and again Egypt, and once more Sodom. That is African and not Galilean interpretation. But when he proceeds to say on the phrase "and the daughter-in-law against her mother-in-law": "Ecclesiam adversus Synagogam," and declares that these two are divided by the

[1] *Comm. in Matt.* xii. 24 (*P.G.* xiii. 1037 C).
[2] *Homilia in Lucam* xiii. 24 (*P.G.* xiii. 1831 B–C).
[3] *Horæ Semiticæ*, V. 49–50.
[4] *P.L.* xxxv. 1365.

sword of the Spirit which is the Word of God, then the African bishop is turning his face towards Galilee. It will be shown how as soon as the witness for Chrysostom has been called. Before that is done, Euthymius Zigabenus must be heard because his witness makes a link between Hippo and Antioch. He enquires[1] what is this sword of which Jesus Christ speaks, and answers that it is the sword of the Word, the divider between faith and unfaith ; or, again, it divides the believers and the unbelievers. When he goes on to deal with Matthew x. 36, which speaks of a man's foes as being they of his own household, he treats it as a prophetic word spoken concerning the Jews.[2] Euthymius knew certain of the older writers ; and here he allows the emergence of the hint of anti-Judaism in these Sayings of Jesus. We shall see that this is the link between Augustine and Chrysostom. It is a pity that Hilary of Poitiers is such a distracting writer on Matthew. He might have kept the ancient strain of meaning we are seeking, for he has stored up some old literary things. Instead of which he must needs intrude Exodus xx. 12[3] into his discussion of the Sayings about the relations of a disciple of Jesus Christ, and make the meanings turn upon the maintenance of refinements of family life. Thence he trails off into a curious moral arithmetic concerning the parts of man's nature and their counterparts in his household, and for this arithmetic the divisor is concupiscence. Hilary is no helper either on the way to Antioch or back to Galilee of the first century. And yet in missing the essential key to the Sayings of Matthew x. he is one of a large company which reaches down to the twentieth century.

It is not a little remarkable that books on the Christian

[1] *P.G.* cxxix. 343 C–D.
[2] *P.G.* cxxix. 344 D ; for his after-mentioned views, 344 C and 529 C.
[3] *P.L.* ix. 975 B.

Thought of the first century, which have but recently appeared, should have ignored or known scarce how to handle this factor of anti-Judaism in primitive Christianity. There is no room for doubt that this factor is in the teaching of Jesus Christ, and that it was the cause of His "having not where to lay His head," and of His death. Its interpenetration into the whole texture of the Christianity of the first century is to be seen in the writings that follow the Gospels, as well as in the few Christian writings of the same date which are not included in the New Testament. The discovery of this factor, which is chiefly due to my revered colleague Rendel Harris, means that we shall have to revise our commentaries and our theologies. It is to be granted that it is an *enfant terrible* to put among our accepted views. Nevertheless it must be done.

This matter can be tested on the Sayings under discussion, and with the help of Chrysostom. If his interesting series of tractates entitled *Adversus Judæos*, v. 3, are turned to, there the Antiochian preacher has treasured the first meanings. These eight books make up a keen piece of controversial work in the realm of Christology. He gathers the Jews into a typical figure with whom he carries on his argument in almost dialogue form. In the immediate context [1] of Chrysostom's use of the Sayings from Matthew x. he is set against the claim that Jesus Christ is an impostor. This Chrysostom rebuts by showing that He is the Saviour and the very principle of the Christian's life. He then quotes Matthew x. 34 and 35, and marks with sword-like clearness the difference between believers and unbelievers in the same household. Now, the unbeliever for Chrysostom is the Jew. At first this might seem as if it was obviously true that a Jew who had not turned to Jesus Christ was an unbeliever. Thus we should miss the significance of

[1] *P.G.* xlvii. 888.

Chrysostom's use of the Sayings. These eight books of his, with the general title *Adversus Judæos*, are in the succession of most ancient *Anti-Judaica*. The famous Antiochian knew and used the first century *Testimonies against the Jews*, as the text of his eight books shows. It is at this point that Augustine and Euthymius can be brought in: the former because he has kept an actual note from the primitive Christological book, the *Testimonies*; and the latter because he has kept a true anti-Judaic note in his exegesis. Augustine, it will be remembered, preserves the brief comment: "Ecclesiam adversus Synagogam." If now Cyprian's text[1] of the first century *Testimonies* is referred to, it will be found to have a division with the heading (i. 20): "Quod *Ecclesia* quae prius sterilis fuerat plures filios habitura esset ex gentibus, quam quot *Synagoga* ante habuisset." The heading of the preceding section of this text, it should be noticed, has to do with the allied subject of the Two Peoples—the Jew and the Christian marked out as the surpassed and the surpasser. How truly these matters belong to the first century can be seen from that very early New Testament writing, the Letter to the Galatians and in its fourth chapter.[2] There is no call to give more detailed evidence here. This subject, then, that Augustine introduces as a comment on the Sayings from Matthew x. 34 sq. goes back to the period before the writing of the earliest book in the New Testament. It comes from the same source as Chrysostom drew upon for his polemical writings. The Anti-Judaism of primitive Christianity is a static element in the thought of Augustine—he knows of it and scarcely knows what he has heard; but in Chrysostom it is an active element, and he uses it at least as much and truly as the writer of the fourth Gospel. This most im-

[1] *P.L.* iv. 689 C.
[2] Harris and Burch: *Testimonies, Part II.*, 1920, 32 ff.

portant matter can be summed up in a sentence: the Revelation of Jesus Christ abrogated the whole scheme of ideas and practices in the Hebrew Religion. There is now an adequate and historical reason for the results of his work and speech at the hands of the Jews. Both in His life and death those consequences pre-suppose Anti-Judaism on His part. Therefore, the disciple must be as His Lord. The sword that Jesus casts on the earth cannot bring peace; since, if His revelation is the ultimate one, it will rend the web of Jewish life and thought from top to bottom. There is no illustration so enlightening of the clean and sure work of that blade in the life of a Jew as that of Paul. These Sayings of Jesus bloomed into great life in His servant. He actually lived them. Thus, the Sayings concerning a disciple's turning away from his relations do not teach Asceticism, as if Jesus was demanding a break with the flesh and the bodily in behalf of the soul and the spiritual; but they teach the pre-eminence of Himself and His teaching, and that demands a total break with a religion and religionists inimical to His revelation.

Are the related Sayings concerning cross-bearing to be understood in the same manner? Three chief lines of meaning are found in these Sayings by ancient writers. For example, Euthymius considers the bearing of the cross to be the token of martyrdom; Isho'dad says of it: "He who counts not himself to this world as one who is already crucified to it by means of his love, is of no use to My discipleship"; whilst Hilary informs a Pauline saying with a new motive when he writes: "They who are Christ's have crucified the body with its vices and concupiscences." These views represent three orders of ascetical emphasis.[1]

[1] Cf. the latest book on Egyptian Asceticism, Mackean: *Christian Monasticism in Egypt*, 1920, 153, where this order of Saying is made to be the reason why such practices existed.

The Syrian commentator comes nearest to the interpretation that is popular, where either thought or churchmanship is desirous of drawing away from the institution of Asceticism. The feeling is right in that endeavour; but the fundamental work in idea has not yet been achieved. This can be carried out if we can recover the values that Jesus put into these Sayings. They come after the sword Sayings. It would appear that they tell with utter simplicity what is the consequence of following the Anti-Judaism of the Lord. The disciple will go day by day to the place of shame. For the Deuteronomic law was well known where it applied to the case of the man who contemned the supreme or priestly authority, or rose to teach another law than the Hebrew canonical law, or prophesied in "the name of other gods" than those of Israel.[1] Death was the penalty for these deeds. Just so was it enacted in the later legal book, *Sanhedrin* xi. 2–5, that death is the part of the dissenting teacher and of the false prophet. Now, under Roman government death was by the cross instead of the Jewish modes of strangulation or stoning. Jesus Christ was brought to the cross, and for the historical reasons we have found. In His Sayings, then, concerning bearing the cross, He is telling His followers that if they follow His ways of most profound dissent from Judaism they must become familiar with the fact and way of the cross. His sword, in those days, could only cleave a path to the cross. The men who followed Him would so know this daily that, when the time came, there would be (as it were) a furrow in the shoulder to take the wooden beam. It will be seen that this view of these Sayings is congruous with the Anti-Judaism of the preceding series; and, moreover, that in it there is no place for the notion of martyrdom or of Asceticism. The Sayings concerning bearing the cross embody a calm weighing and

[1] Cf. Deut. xvii. 12, xviii. 20.

acceptance of the consequences of discipleship to One whose revelation was, in the interests of the redemption of mankind, anti-Judaic.

It may be said that now these Sayings have only local reference. They can apply with any exactness merely to the men about Jesus Christ in first-century Galilee. Their historic qualities do not make them less significant for our own days; and especially is this so when we ask what is the measure of the claim in Christ's revelation. To make Him and that pre-eminent is still to follow the sword. There are many, in the different fields of the missionary world, who fulfil literally to-day both His sword and cross-bearing Sayings. The enactments of governments in the West do not set up the cross in the path of those who would follow the Christ. And yet the sword and the cross stand for the uniqueness of Himself and His revelation; and the claim to follow Him holds throughout the ages.

VACHER BURCH.

THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE SUMMING UP OF ALL THINGS IN CHRIST.

THE intention of this article is to set forth some aspects of St. Paul's conception of God's ideal for the world, so far as the present writer understands it—the ideal which the apostle calls "the eternal purpose" of God, God's "purpose of the ages" (Eph. iii. 11).

We have learnt at last to recognise the power in human society of what Mr. Benjamin Kidd calls "the emotion of the ideal." Ideals may be good or bad, worthy or unworthy of our regard; but what they can achieve in directing the steps of a community or a nation is unaffected by their ethical quality. Germany and Japan are two instances

in which, in the last fifty years, certain ideals have gripped the imagination of whole peoples, completely transforming them, with consequences of great moment to the rest of mankind. It is, then, high time that Christian people generally should make practical use of the fact that ideals have this mighty power, and that we should do what we can to introduce the ideals of Christianity, as distinct from its doctrines, to the non-Christian world, and revive these ideals for ourselves—give Christian ideals a chance of taking hold of the imaginations of men—so as to bring about, in a measurable time, a moral and spiritual revolution which will issue in the strengthening as well as the extension of the Kingdom of God.

At times such as the present, when there is so little in what the eye can see and the ear can hear to encourage high hopes for humanity, it is especially important to give extra prominence to the essential optimism of Christianity. Pessimism is the most deadly enemy of the Gospel, more deadly than any doctrinal heresy ; for if we yield to the suggestions of pessimism, we have no good news for the world. It is a good thing to " lift up our eyes unto the hills," not only in expectation of receiving help from that quarter, but because the act itself of lifting up the eyes takes our attention away from the painful and perplexing things immediately around us. A temporary detachment from that which presses upon us daily gives the soul change of air, so to speak, and braces it for the duties of life.

The Christian Church inherited, and carries on, the optimism of the ancient Church of Israel, which found manifold expression in the hope of the Messiah. And although the hope of Israel was more than realized in the historical manifestation of Christ, it did not end there ; it was, on the contrary, raised to an infinite power ; the hope of one small nation was found to be not only a blessing to

all the families of the earth, but the hope of all creation.

The Apostle Paul it was who was called by God to formulate this hope, to make a theory about it, to give it a place in a scheme of the universe. I shall not now delay to discuss how far the infinite application of the Gospel is inherent in the teaching and claims of our Lord as recorded in the Gospels; it is sufficient to say that while what we read in the Gospels fits into St. Paul's scheme, the most complete expression of Christian optimism is to be found in the Epistles to the Ephesians and the Colossians. More than once St. Paul affirms that his doctrine as to the eternal purpose of God in Christ had been revealed to him; it was a secret revealed, a *mystery*, "the mystery of the Christ" (Eph. i. 9; iii. 3, 4, 9; vi. 19; Col. i. 26, 27; ii. 2; iv. 3); he disclaims all originality in his teaching. We need not now go into that question; it is enough to say that, if sublimity is a characteristic of a divine revelation, there are few conceptions worthier of inclusion in the category of revealed truths than the Pauline doctrine of Christ and the universe. And it is not a little significant, that it was while Paul was a prisoner, debarred from active apostolic work, that he penned the most world-moving sentences that are to be found in the New Testament. Thus does "the fierceness of man turn to the praise of God."

For St. Paul, at this stage of his doctrinal development, the Christ is no longer merely the Jewish Messiah as he was thought of in the rabbinical schools. He is a person; but not a self-contained, completed person; he is, from one point of view, in the making. As the Word or Wisdom of God, the Second Person of the Trinity possesses all the perfections of the Godhead (Col. ii. 9); he is the agent in the creation, and "in him all things hold together" (Col. i. 17). We must think of the relation of the Son to the Father and to the material universe as absolute.

But in relation to the world as affected by moral evil, he is the Christ, God incarnate in man, the expression in human life of the self-revelation of God. We need not now enquire whether this self-revelation would have been made in any case, even if there had been no sin in the world—the Scotist as opposed to the Thomist view;—the fact is that sin is here. The fact of sin, the great anomaly in the cosmos, is one of St. Paul's postulates; we cannot now discuss it.

We assume, then, that the world has been alienated and estranged from God by sin; and the Incarnation is the "means devised" by God "that his banished be not expelled from him." "God was in Christ reconciling the world unto himself" (2 Cor. v. 19). "It was the good pleasure of the Father . . . through [Christ] to reconcile all things unto himself" (Col. i. 19, 20). God is revealed to us as gradually, slowly but surely, recovering wholly for himself whatever of his creation has been alienated from him by sin.

The whole process of this reconciliation of the world to God is described by St. Paul as "a new creation" (2 Cor. v. 17; Gal. vi. 15). We have, in modern times, become familiar with the conception of the first creation, the creation of the material and physical world, as an age-long process, not a work of six days of twenty-four hours each. There is, therefore, no cause for stumbling in the notion that the moral and spiritual creation is a slow process, as we count slowness.

A beginning of this new creation was made in the Incarnation, when the new humanity, humanity raised into union with God, was concentrated in one human body, "the last Adam" (Rom. v. 14; 1 Cor. xv. 45).

As the Last Adam, Christ is the parent of the human element in the new creation; and as St. Paul expresses the

relation of all men, naturally born, to our first parent by saying that they are "in Adam" (1 Cor. xv. 22), in like manner he speaks of all members of the new or spiritual creation as being "in Christ." There is a world of Christian experience concentrated in that often recurring phrase, "in Christ."

It would be irrelevant to my present purpose to do more than allude to the significance for the personal life of the individual soul of the expression "in Christ." Just now we are thinking of what Christ holds out for humanity at large, indeed for the universe; and the hope for the universe is, in Pauline thought, incorporation in Christ, in the body of Christ. The eternal purpose of God is, "to sum up all things in Christ." When this has been accomplished, the reconciliation of creation to its Father will have been completed.

Meanwhile, let us consider St. Paul's theory of the process. And let us think in the first place of the human element, mankind. Human life, as God first saw it and as God at last will see it, is a sacred thing. In so far as human life is alienated from God, it is not because it is material, but because it is defiled by sin. Hence one of the things purposed by God is "the redemption of our body" (Rom. viii. 23); not the annihilation of our body, as a perverted spirituality might suppose. Nay, God makes use of material things for our spiritual advancement; God gives us the most precious spiritual gifts through material channels. This method of the Divine working is known as the Sacramental Principle; but the sacraments of the Church are only examples of a principle which is of universal application. Of this principle the Incarnation is the supreme example and type.

It was stated above that the process of the reconciling of the world to God had a beginning in the human body of

the risen Jesus. The process is continued, has been continued ever since the Day of Penetcost, in the spiritual body of Christ, the continuation of the Incarnation, the society of the children of the Second Adam, even they who share in the fresh life of the new creation and so are " partakers of the divine nature." This society is identified by St. Paul with the Church ; the Church is frequently called by him " the body of Christ."

If we would do justice in our own minds to St. Paul's theory of the Church, if we would make practical use of it in our efforts towards the betterment of humanity, we must begin by getting rid, as far as is possible, of our inherited prejudices in relation to the Church, prejudices which have their origin in the history of the Church in the past. We must, for a time, cease to think in terms of particular institutions, creeds, systems of Church government, historic or national churches.

There is no question at present as to whether these things, or some of them, are good or bad, necessary or useless ; what we are now trying to do is to recover for ourselves, in this twentieth century, what St. Paul, in the first century, conceived of the Church as the instrument, or the means through which, and in which, the eternal purpose of God is being worked out.

The Church, then, is the continuation of the Incarnation, the expression of Christ in the world, his body, that by which his personality comes from time to time into human relationships with mankind ; just as the body of any individual man is that by which his personality has dealings in the material sphere with other men. St. Paul said to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xii. 27), and he still says to us, " Ye are the body of Christ, and severally members thereof." That signifies that the only means Christ has of expressing himself in human society is the thoughts, words and deeds

of the men and women who profess and call themselves Christians. This is a thought at once stimulating and humbling, when we think how pitiably inadequate is the presentation of Christ shewn in the lives of most of us. We cannot, however, follow up that line of thought at present.

As being the body of Christ, St. Paul terms it "his fulness," his *pleroma* (Eph. i. 23). The term *fulness* here means that which fills a receptacle, the content of a thing. If one could image a receptacle continually expanding and always full, the fulness of it would likewise be constantly increasing in quantity. The fulness, in this sense, of a human person increases as he advances from early infancy to maturity: the embryo becomes an infant; the infant a child; the child a youth; the youth a full-grown man. Now this is precisely what St. Paul says in reference to the Christ in human society: Christ, he says, is "being fulfilled"; "the Church is his body, the fulness of him who all in all is being fulfilled" (Eph. i. 23). And "the building up of the body of Christ" will go on "till we all attain unto . . . a fullgrown man, unto the measure of the stature of the fulness of Christ" (Eph. iv. 12, 13).

It was of this consummation that Tennyson was thinking when he spoke of

> "one far-off divine event,
> To which the whole creation moves."

"The whole creation"; for God's eternal purpose is "to sum up all things in Christ." The last charge of our Lord to the apostles, as given in the primitive appendix to the Second Gospel, was, "Preach the gospel to the whole creation" (Mark xvi. 15). And St. Paul, with splendid prophetical audacity, "declaring the end from the beginning," affirms that the gospel which the Colossians had heard "was preached in all creation under heaven" (Col. i. 23).

If the Church is what St. Paul declares it to be, the visible,

tangible expression in human society of what can be seen from time to time of the process of the working out of God's purpose, if it is the body of Christ in the various stages of its growth, then plainly the Church is very immature, very young.

For the Church is to incorporate *all things*. The Apostle does not say *some things*; much less does he contemplate God as leaving to his creature, man, the selection of the things which are to be summed up in Christ.

There are here indicated vast thought-regions, the existence of which it is foolish to deny merely because we are unable to explore them. The purpose of God goes beyond humanity. Our Lord said on one occasion, "I will draw all men unto myself" (John xii. 32). Many Christians find this prediction a severe strain on faith. Yet the divine plan as revealed to St. Paul relates to *all things*, "the things in the heavens and the things upon the earth."

But "let us return to the earth our habitation," as Bishop Butler would say, and think of the Church as embracing *all men*. It is surely our wisdom to keep God's ideal before us, so that we may not do anything to retard the accomplishment of it. This is not a merely academic question or a matter of theological speculation only; it is a practical subject of great and immediate interest; for our attitude towards it affects the mental and moral atmosphere in which we judge present-day problems. The mutual relations of the white and the coloured races; the union of the sections into which Christendom is divided; the ultimate solution of the baffling problems involved in these and similar questions must be found in God's ideal for man. And a frank recognition of God's ideal for man must affect our conception of the Church in which, and through which, God's ideal for man is being realised.

If it is God's purpose to sum up all things, including man,

in Christ, that is, in the Church, then, the Church is relative to *all* human activities. It is in the midst of man (Luke xvii. 21), normally functioning by attracting them to itself, acting as the medium through which Christ draws all men unto himself. The Church attracts men when it is in a healthy state ; when it is in a diseased state, it repels them. The Church will not have got within sight of its fullgrown state until it has assimilated the divine something in everything that is now outside itself.

In the process of the Church's growth by taking in from without, the substance, so to speak, of each of the things that had been without, but are now within the Church, is interpenetrated and transmuted by the Spirit of Christ, which is the Church's vital energy. And, on the other hand, the Body of Christ is enriched by the addition of the new substance ; and this addition is not merely quantitative, but it involves also a modification of the quality of the whole into something slightly different from what had been there before. The addition of a new race of men to the Church is not a numerical addition merely ; it is the infusion of a fresh human quality into the already mixed mass of redeemed mankind ; and this affects not only the quality of the Church as a whole, but, more or less, the nature of the various elements already in it.

This process of growth is not only slow, as men count slowness, but it also involves exceedingly complicated conditions. It is natural for men, in some moods, to resent the changes of all kinds that are inevitable at each stage of Christ's fulfilling himself ; but it is our wisdom and happiness to accept, and even welcome, them as necessary to the working out of the eternal purpose of God, and as evidence that advance is being made.

The prophet Ezekiel has given us (chap. xlvii.) a noble picture of the growth of the Kingdom of God, in his account

of the mystical river of healing waters whose source was in the temple of God. He tells how at a distance of a thousand cubits there were "waters that were to the ankles," and further on, "waters that were to the knees," then, "waters that were to the loins," and finally, "a river that could not be passed through." May one, without presumption, introduce a new feature into this picture, and imagine a river of healing waters, a river of God, yet also fed by tributaries on either side, many tributaries, each of a different quality of water, with noxious as well as wholesome elements, none wholly good, none wholly bad? As the waters of each tributary mingle with those of the main stream of healing water, the noxious element in it is made wholesome; and, on the other hand, the river of God is further enriched, in quality as well as in volume, by each last addition; and the mighty stream reaches the ocean, its goal, more complex in nature, but not less a river of God than when it issued from its divine source in simple purity. In some such way is Christ in humanity "being fulfilled" in and through the Church, "that wonderful and sacred mystery."

The Church, then, it would appear, is a cosmic fact, Catholic, universal, in the widest sense of that word. It is noteworthy that in the earliest document in which the term *The Catholic Church* occurs, its essentially supramundane nature is expressed in the most striking fashion. St. Ignatius of Antioch, writing to the Smyrnaeans, says (c. viii.). "Wherever Jesus may be, there is the Catholic Church." Thus, it is not merely true that "wherever two or three are gathered together in Christ's name, there he is in the midst of them"; it is also eternally true that the Catholic Church, in the idea of it (using the term *idea* in the Platonic sense—the ideal which some day will be realised) shares in Jesus Christ's universality of presence and comprehensiveness; the Church is, in fact, a cosmic institution.

Meanwhile, let us consider the actually existing state of things. And first let us note that while the Church is the nucleus of the Kingdom of God on earth, "God's tilled land" (1 Cor. iii. 9), we must not forget that God is working in that large part of his field which is not yet within the Church's pale. His work is preparatory and constructive: He is bringing together things that were apart, influencing "them that are without" so that they come to be "not far from the Kingdom of God," as when a young Brahmin student, moved by the spirit of the Christ, tenderly nurses a dying outcaste. God is making "natural men" fit to receive and appreciate "spiritual things," while he is making the Church itself an increasingly adequate and attractive exponent of spiritual things.

From what has been said above it would appear that we cannot expect to find in the Church, at any one stage of its growth, all the features and characteristics which will be apparent in its perfected state. This is a truism; yet it is a consideration often forgotten in the thoughts and words of men as they speak and write about the Catholic Church.

On the one hand, the Church is a Body. The term *body* is suggestive of a oneness that is definite, something which, however immature, is yet cognizable by the senses. On the other hand, the unity of the Church must be a unity which is consistent with an "infinite variety." As things now are, the Light of the world is seen refracted in many different rays of varying colour and varying intensity. The convergence of these rays is necessary if one would see the Light in its purity and fulness. The various elements—races, nations, etc.—which from time to time have been brought into the Church express severally various aspects of the Christ, "broken lights" of the Light of the World.

At the same time, the conception of the Church as a body suggests that, however that body may be enriched and

endowed with new functions in the course of its growth, it will have certain constant characteristics essential to its being the kind of body it is, characteristics implanted at its birth, necessary to the nature and conditions of its life; and therefore permanent.

Again, some of its characteristics, although present in some degree at all periods of its life, are not all equally in evidence at all stages of its growth; and it has yet other characteristics which must await the perfection of their development on the day of the Church's consummation, when "the sons of God will be revealed."

Meanwhile, it is natural to ask, Where is the Body of Christ at this present moment in human society? In other words, What are the necessary elements in the Church, elements the possession of which entitles one group, or some groups, of men to be called the Church, while the title is denied to another group as large or larger, and equally respectable?

The answer to this question is, speaking broadly, that whatever was essential to the life of the Church in the apostolic age is a necessity of its life in all ages. A fullgrown man normally performs functions of which an infant is incapable; yet what is necessary to the life of an infant does not differ essentially from that which supports the life of an adult.

To make an appeal to one particular, short, period of the Church's life, and that too the earliest period, may seem, perhaps, inconsistent with the stress that has been laid in this paper on the practical importance of the conception of the infinite expansion of the Church. But it is not so in fact. We must not always think of life in terms of time. The oscillations of the pendulum or the apparent movements of the heavenly bodies are useful in the computation of time for the daily round of human occupations; but periods of

time computed equal in this way are by no means equal when you introduce the condition of growth into the comparison of them one with another. The months between the conception of an infant and its birth are, so far as it is concerned, a longer period than its years of life from birth to old age. The first five years of actual life are, in this sense, longer than the years between the ages of thirty and fifty.

In like manner, the few years between the resurrection of Jesus and the death of St. John the Apostle were, as regards the development of the Church, as long as all the subsequent centuries put together. Those initial years were a creative epoch. Let us keep steadily before us the idea expressed in the phrase "The Body of Christ." The Apostolic Church, then, may be compared to the body of a new-born infant, a complete, though immature, human being. If the physical body be defective at birth, no prolongation of life can supply, or make up for, the congenital deficiency.

To be explicit:—vital union with the living Christ is that in which the life of the Church consists. We have seen that the Incarnation of God in Christ is the great world sacrament. That which is the continuation of the Incarnation, the Church, as the Body of Christ, is similarly sacramental in its mode of existence; and the life of each of the members of that body is sacramentally maintained. And so we find, from the earliest times, as essential institutions in the Church (1) the divinely commissioned ministry; and (2), (3) the sacraments of the new Birth and of spiritual nutriment. These are the sacramental assurances of the presence of Christ in the Church. "Wherever Jesus Christ may be there is the Catholic Church."

NEWPORT J. D. WHITE.

THE ECSTATIC ELEMENT IN OLD TESTAMENT PROPHECY.[1]

At the risk of repeating what is familiar to most students of the Old Testament, it may be worth while to recapitulate certain facts. At the beginning of the Christian era, there was a certain religious phenomenon, which we may call the "ecstasy," widely distributed over the world. It manifested itself in many forms and in connexion with the cult of many deities, male and female. It was associated with the oracular utterances of Apollo at Delphi and elsewhere, possibly also with Dionysus, and shewed itself in a lower form in the antics of the disreputable priests of Isis and the great Asiatic goddess. It may be traced back in history, and appears everywhere as a foreign element in religion, except in Syria and Asia Minor.[2] There it is found in the earliest times of which we have any record, and gives the impression of being native to the shores of the eastern Mediterranean. Whilst there are references, e.g., in the writers of Egypt, to this phenomenon, there is only one of the peoples of Syria which has left us any real body of literature, and in this literature, which is our Old Testament, it is possible to see more clearly than elsewhere what this phenomenon was really like, and the use to which it was originally put.

In ancient Israel, then, and in the surrounding peoples, there appears a class of people known as N^{e}bi'im. They were consecrated to the worship and service of a particular deity, and were supposed to be in some sort of extraordinary communication with him (or her). Thus we hear, not only

[1] Notes of a paper read before the Society for Old Testament Study in Edinburgh, July, 1920.

[2] Cf. the present writer's article "Baal in Hellas," *Classical Quarterly*, October, 1916.

of the N^{e}bi'im of Yahweh, but also of the N^{e}bi'im of the Tyrian Baal. But in external appearance they were not sharply distinguished from one another; and though the piety of later ages has eliminated a good deal of the picture of the N^{e}bi'im of Yahweh, as being unworthy of a unique God, there are still traces which enable us to allow for the idealisation and to see behind it phenomena in Israel which were very similar to those which prevailed, for instance, in Phœnicia.

It may be remarked at once that the external characteristics of the ecstasy were not clearly distinguished from those of insanity. Saul's ravings (and Saul is the only one of the earlier N^{e}bi'im of whom details of this kind have been preserved) are called "prophesying" (התנבא) in 1 Samuel xviii. 10. The Nabi' who brought to Jehu the message which gave the signal for revolt is described as a "madman" (משגע) by the spectators (2 Kings ix. 11), and the same epithet is applied (by implication) to Jeremiah (Jeremiah xxix. 26). The physical effects varied a good deal. Sometimes there would be extreme activity, and the limbs would be flung wildly about. There would be a certain tendency to rhythmic movement, which would produce some kind of dance. There would be wild and savage attacks on the body, and knives and whips would be freely used; so freely, in fact, as to suggest that the ecstatic condition involved insensibility to pain. This appears to have been the case both with the N^{e}bi'im of Baal on Mount Carmel and the priests of Isis described by Apuleius. On the other hand the result might be a constriction of the muscles, producing a condition similar to that known as the trance.

The ecstasy might be induced to some extent by external stimuli. In many cases the effect seems to have been due to intoxicating vapours such as were characteristic of the

oracles of Delphi, and (if we can trust Vergil) of Cumæ. More often in Palestine it seems to have been due to music, which indeed played a fairly large part in the experience of the Nabi'. So Elisha appears to be unable to "prophesy" till a harp is played before him, and one account ascribes David's first introduction to Saul to his skill as a musician. Whilst in its present form it appears that David's music was intended to allay the prophetic spirit, it is possible that in the earliest tradition its purpose was the excitement of the ecstasy. Sometimes an attempt was made to induce the ecstasy by simulating its effects. This may be true of the Carmel story. And one feature of the phenomenon is to be seen in its contagion. A person otherwise unaffected might be stimulated to "prophetic" action by the presence of others in the ecstatic state. This is clearly the case with Saul.

The last feature leads on to the remark that the N^{e}bi'im tended to be gregarious. They wandered about the country in bands, or lived in some kind of common settlement. The ecstasy would normally fall on the whole group, though speedily one would stand out as the leader. This is the testimony of Apuleius, and the case of Zedekiah ben K^{e}naanah comes at once to mind (1 Kings xxii. 9–12, 24). So the leader would often explain or reinforce his message by symbolic action, as Zedekiah did with his horns of iron.

Such were, roughly, the main external signs of the ecstasy. But, in later times the situation was complicated, at least in Israel, by the identification of the Nabi' with the "Seer." Of this latter type of person, as a distinct character, practically nothing seems to be known from sources outside Israel. There is, however, the familiar note in 1 Samuel ix. 9, which records the older practice in contrast with the new, and makes it clear that Samuel was a "Seer" and not a Nabi'. That the two terms were used almost indiscriminately in the middle of the eighth century is clear from Amos vii,

12, where Amaziah calls Amos a "Seer" (חוזה) and tells him that Judah is the place for him to get his living by "prophesying" (התנבא). It is also fairly clear that the "Seer" was a person who would be aware, in some way or other, of facts that were hidden from the ordinary man, and that he was prepared to supply information on the basis of this special knowledge. The pictures of the earlier N^{e}bi'im hardly suggest that they had this power; with them the characteristic feature was the ecstasy, which might or might not bring to the observer an answer to a definite problem. There are thus two obvious distinctions between the primitive Nabi' and the primitive Seer. One is that the Nabi' functioned spontaneously, while the Seer worked to order, and the other is that the Nabi' was ecstatic while the Seer was not. We have no record of people "enquiring" of Saul, nor is there any suggestion of abnormal behaviour on the part of Samuel.

In the ecstasy of the later composite type there is one feature which has not yet been mentioned. That is the so-called "second sight," though the phenomena are at least as much auditory as visual. The subject became conscious of two worlds, that which was normal with him and with others, and also one which was peculiar to his consciousness, and even then only temporary. This is characteristic of many of the later prophets, and seems to be beyond dispute in such cases as Isaiah (especially the experience recorded in chapter vi.), Amos and Jeremiah. Its further extent may be left for later discussion. One may hazard a conjecture on philological grounds that this was the characteristic of the primitive Seer, whilst the ecstasy marked the primitive Nabi'. The fusion of the two appears in the later Prophet[1] from Micaiah onwards.

[1] Throughout this paper the term "Nabi'" has been used to indicate the earlier type and the term "prophet" to indicate the later one.

The secondary experience may be compared with the phenomena of hypnosis, though with important differences. For instance, in the latter case, the deeper the hypnotic state, the more certain are the experiences to leave no trace on the normal memory; in the former case the more intense the experience, the more clearly was it recalled afterwards.

When we turn to the canonical prophets, i.e., those whose words are preserved for us in the Old Testament, an important question arises. How far were these men ecstatic? It has become customary to regard them as being merely preachers of righteousness. But how did they receive their message, and how did they deliver it? What did they look like to the people round about them? There were innumerable prophets other than those whose words have come down to us. There were people who stood frequently in direct opposition to them. Such was Hananiah, Jeremiah's opponent, and such were the unnamed individuals against whom the canonical prophets sometimes inveigh. One gets the impression—not wholly a correct one—that the public were always ready to listen to the "false" prophet and to disregard the true. But it may well be asked whether the average man could clearly distinguish between them. It is quite conceivable that to him both types looked exactly alike, and differed only in the content of their message. In that case he may well be forgiven if he allowed his opinions to be swayed and his actions to be directed by the majority rather than by the lonely man who stood out against the rest.

Answers to this question vary between two extremes. On the one hand there is the view of scholars like Hölscher,[1] who believe that the canonical prophets were ecstatic from first to last, and that their words were uttered under the immediate stress of this condition. On the other hand, there

[1] Cf. *Die Propheten*, 1914.

are those who, with Buttenwieser,[1] would deny the ecstatic element altogether to the "writing" prophets. This is certainly the older view, and is assumed in the work of nearly all commentators, though perhaps the assumption is in some cases an unconscious one. Marti, for instance, is by no means blind to the fact of the second sight (cf. his comment on Isaiah xxi. 6, where, however, he distinctly denies the full phenomena of the ecstasy), yet he writes as though the prophetic books were products of the study. Still more is this the case with Harper, who, admitting a certain similarity in character between the visions of the earlier N^{e}bi'im and those of Amos and Jeremiah, denies entirely the element of "trance" in the latter (cf. *Amos and Hosea*, p. cxxiv.). And Harper went so far as to believe, not only that the prophet wrote down his own "sermons" deliberately, but that he composed them with care in a somewhat complicated strophic form. All this, of course, is quite inconsistent with such a view as that of Hölscher.

It must be admitted that all one's social, ethical and religious instincts impel one to make a clear-cut distinction between the N^{e}bi'im and the canonical prophets. It cannot be denied that from almost every point of view the latter were more or less disreputable people. One does not like to feel that some of the grandest messages of God to man came through men whom their contemporaries could not distinguish from raving lunatics. It was through them that there came first to the world that epoch-making doctrine that God is at least as good as man, and that He can only be sought and met by those who are prepared to recognise in religion the highest moral standards of which they are capable. It is a very real shock to receive a suggestion that these people were not in outward appearance

[1] Cf. *The Prophets of Israel*, 1914.

and demeanour the highest and the best, but were identified by their fellows with a class so low as the Dervish-like N^{e}bi'im.

At the same time there are two facts that should be borne in mind. One is that the revelation of God always proceeds through the known to the unknown. His methods and instruments are those which are already in the main accepted and admitted by the age and generation to which the message comes. It is necessary that there should be a basis on which to build, a foundation on which the superstructure may be erected. The message of men like Hosea and Jeremiah would have been utterly meaningless and incredible unless the men themselves had certain credentials which would assure their hearers that it was their God who was speaking through them, and no figment of their own imagination.

Further, whilst the N^{e}bi'im had many faults, they had one virtue which gave them the necessary qualification. They were men who stood for their God. Their comprehension of Yahweh may have been imperfect and worse than imperfect. Their methods in social and political life may have been the most detrimental. But, nevertheless, no one could or did doubt that they claimed some special relation to the God of Israel, and that they were in a very real sense devoted to and possessed by Him. That they should have been used to convey one of the greatest truths that have ever come home to man is not surprising when we realise that there were but few others through whom such a revelation could come. Men recognised that they were the "slaves" of Yahweh, and thereby were able to accept as His that message which they had to deliver.

There should be, then, no *a priori* reason why we should deny the existence of an ecstatic element in the work of the canonical prophets. We are free to examine the facts

with unbiassed minds. And the first of these facts is the very name itself. The earliest of the prophets of the Old Testament is almost certainly Amos. His appearance and work at Bethel need no description, but it is worth while to call attention to the impression he made on his audience. It is true that Amos himself denied that he was a professional Nabi', but that statement cannot be interpreted to mean more than that he was not associated with any of the recognised companies of N^{e}bi'im, and that he did not do this work for a living. When Harper (*loc. cit.*) says "that no ecstatic frenzy is in any way suggested," he entirely overlooks the fact that Amaziah certainly took Amos for an ordinary Nabi'. If not, why should he call him one? There must have been that in his manner and method which at least very closely resembled those of the regular N^{e}bi'im. It is clear that the Priest took him for a revolutionary, and the political activities of the N^{e}bi'im were apt to be revolutionary. It was their influence that had set on the throne the very family to which Jeroboam himself belonged. Now, thought Amaziah, these people had grown tired of this dynasty, and seek to overthrow what they established. But Amaziah would hardly have allowed such an idea to enter his mind unless he had had good reason to confuse Amos with the N^{e}bi'im. And it is worth while noticing that it is not in his direct address that he calls Amos a Nabi'. He speaks to him as to a Seer, but in doing so he describes his actions by the word "prophesy" (התנבא). So far from "no ecstatic frenzy" being "suggested," there is no evidence to shew that the reflexive forms of the root *NB'* ever meant anything but "ecstatic frenzy"—at least before the time of Amos. And the circumstances were not such as to suggest the coining of a new meaning for a word with a perfectly familiar and definite connotation. The fact is that *Nabi'* meant an ecstatic, and it is difficult to see how

the term could have been applied to people who had nothing of the ecstatic about them.

Less direct but still important evidence may be derived from other facts in the case. Here were men who had an unpopular message to deliver, and one which in certain cases might seem to be treasonable. Why was Amaziah content to try to send Amos away ? Why did the enemies of Jeremiah leave him to starve in an empty cistern ? Scruples as to the taking of an ordinary man's life under such circumstances were entirely foreign to oriental courts in ancient times. To the eastern mind to starve a man to death is not murder ; to be guilty of that crime one has to deal the fatal blow with one's own hand. Surely the only possible answer was that these men were protected by a religious *tabu* ? It is true that Jehoiakim put Uriah to death, and would have meted out a like fate to Jeremiah, but he is always represented as the bold bad man of power, who feared not God neither regarded man. The slaughter of a " prophet " was a crime often denounced as one of the most heinous, and the sanctity which covered the ordinary Nabi' was extended to the canonical prophets also. It is clear that, except for the content of their message, the latter were not to be distinguished from the former in the popular eye.

Further, the canonical prophets did from time to time secure a hearing. Zedekiah's dealings with Jeremiah are a case in point. So also is the impression produced by Micah, as witnessed by a later generation. If their words were disregarded, this rejection must be ascribed to the fact that they were in the minority. It must not be forgotten that Israelite theology ascribed to Yahweh the occasional habit of delivering a false message through a prophet to his own undoing or that of his hearers. There was even a technical term for this divine deceit—פתה. None the less, the

"prophet," were his words true or false, was Yahweh's slave, and must be respected accordingly.

But, further, there are indications in the prophetic books themselves which point in the same direction. The "visions" of Amos and of Jeremiah are the kind of thing that were produced by the ecstasy. So, too, is the great experience which Isaiah describes in chapter vi., and the visions of Zechariah. Perhaps we do not take some of the phrases of the Old Testament literally enough. It may be that when a prophet said כה אמר יהוה ("Thus saith the Lord") he really meant that he had heard a voice which he recognised as Yahweh's uttering the words which follow. This is ecstasy, though it does not follow that the wilder symptoms were present. And in few cases the impress of a grim experience is left on the oracles. Such is the passage in Jeremiah iv. 23–26, in which the prophet sees the whole universe melting back into the primitive chaos from which it had been formed. The language is too vivid and intense for any mere imagination; Jeremiah had *seen* what he describes. The ecstasy is, perhaps, more strongly marked in Ezekiel than in any other book. A proportion of that book is devoted to symbolic actions, by which the prophet indicated to his fellow-countrymen in Babylonia the fate of Jerusalem. It is true that these actions were performed in silence, and that their meaning was left to be inferred by the spectators, but that meaning was never difficult, and to those about the prophet it must have been obvious. And symbolic actions were characteristic of the ecstatic state. There are, moreover, occasional hints which allow us to suggest that the personal will of the prophet himself might do something to induce this state. Both Jeremiah and Amos are given to staring hard at an object, till their whirling brain perceives more, by sight or sound, than the ordinary man could detect. There is no reason to doubt that

Jeremiah really did see an almond branch and a pot of water boiling on the primitive clay stove. So, too, with the basket of summer fruits and the plumb-line[1] which brought special meaning to Amos.

It may, then, be admitted that the ecstasy played some part in the work of some of the canonical prophets. Is it possible to go further, and to attempt to determine whether the scope of the ecstasy was limited? In other words, is there reason to believe that in some, perhaps many cases the prophet had no ecstatic warrant for the word which he spoke, but simply uttered it from a strong but controlled conviction of the profound truth of the message he had to deliver? The evidence of the text itself is against such a view. There are various phenomena which come partly under the head of textual criticism and partly under that of higher criticism tending to the belief that the oracle was, strictly speaking, almost always short. In our prophetic books as they stand to-day there are few oracles which extend beyond the limits of a dozen or fifteen lines.[2] In the whole Book of Jeremiah there are only two instances where these limits are exceeded (xx. 7–13, which has eighteen lines, and v. 1–9, which has twenty-five). In each case it is doubtful whether the passage comes strictly under the head of "oracle." The longest oracle in the Book of Amos is vi. 1–7, or about a dozen lines. It is true that there are long sections of books which seem to indicate a logical or a historical development. Isaiah xl.–xlviii. may be offered as an instance. But in these cases the arrangement is almost certainly that of the compiler (who may have been the prophet himself), and there are a large number of small oracles involved. Even in the form in which they have

[1] אנך. Is it possible that the word אנכי—"I" has accidentally dropped out of Yahweh's words to the prophet?

[2] Cf. The present writer's article on "The Structure of the Book of Jeremiah," Expositor, July, 1920.

reached us there are few, if any, oracles which might not have been uttered in a momentary burst of ecstasy.

But though from this point of view it is possible to ascribe practically all the prophetic oracles to the ecstatic state it by no means follows that this account of them is necessarily the true one. It seems clear that it must have been true in some cases, and that it may be true in all; but the further deduction lacks direct evidence. At the same time there is reason to believe, from what may be called the philological evidence, that the ecstatic condition was frequent with the prophets, and their utterances may have originated thus. This being so, unless direct testimony can be brought to shew that there were cases in which the prophet's speech was not delivered under the stress of ecstasy, the probability lies on the side of the assumption that the ecstasy was at least normal.

Against this view, there are two obvious points which may be urged. One is that the oracles of the prophets are usually in a somewhat artificial form, either as poetry or as prose. And, notwithstanding a tendency to regard the oracle as a kind of "elevated" or rhetorical prose, and not poetry at all (Rothstein may be quoted as a prominent scholar who holds this view), it is not impossible that *all* the prophetic oracles were at one time in poetical form. They have been copied and recopied. Some of them had a considerable history before their inclusion in the books in which they now stand, and many have undergone a process of redaction which has left them almost pure prose. A case of this kind seems to occur in Jeremiah iii. 6–18.[1] And the poetry of the prophets is not infrequently as regular metrically as that of the poetical books proper. Thus, in the whole of the Book of Jeremiah, when the text has been corrected by

[1] The Jeremianic authorship of this passage has been denied, but its use by Ezekiel is practically decisive in its favour.

the help of the LXX (in this book a most important guide), there remain only about sixty instances in which the rhythm betrays irregularities. In some other books the proportion is perhaps smaller.

The question then arises as to whether this strict poetic form is really consistent with the ecstatic origin of the oracles. To many minds it will seem that it is not. If the Hebrew rhythms were as exact as the Greek—or even as Ley or Grimme would make the Hebrew ones themselves to be—one might well share this view. But, after all, Hebrew rhythm depends on the meaning even more than on the sound. Its basis is the significant word, and it is a kind of rhythmic chant in which the number and character of the syllables may vary to an extent which at present seems almost indefinite. There is nothing absurd in suggesting that in the ecstasy the bodily movements were regular and rhythmic. We know that dancing was characteristic of this state, and dancing implies, especially to the Oriental, the rhythmic movement of the whole body, not merely of the feet and legs. This may be illustrated by the various meanings of the root חול. That rhythmic movements should be accompanied by rhythmic speech is an obvious probability. We may even go further and say that if the ecstasy involved both dancing and speech, it is most likely that the speech would have to be rhythmic. Of course, we are by no means sure that the "dance" was an invariable feature of the ecstasy—indeed, we know it was not, but in those cases where we have the absence of movement (cf. Ezekiel) we have also the absence of speech.

But there is another possibility which must not be ignored in this connexion. We meet with the ecstatic prophecy in the Græco-Roman world. In these cases it seems to have been usual for the actual words of the practitioner to be quite unintelligible, and it is generally

supposed that it was the priests who set them in order and gave them their poetic form. It may be pointed out at once, however, that the limitations of the hexameter or of the Greek elegiac couplet made the classical rhythms entirely unsuitable to the form of the ecstatic utterance, even as the very nature of the Hebrew rhythm would be quite in harmony with the other phenomena. But this may not be the true explanation. Our oracles were at some time or other written down. Sometimes they were written at the instance of the prophet, or even by himself. The prophets seem to have had clear recollection of the actual words they had used, and were able to reproduce them. If this is actually the case, then it is clear that they were uttered in the poetical form in which they were first written down—or in which many of them were written down.

There are, however, grave objections to the view that the oracular poems were uttered during the access of the ecstasy. As has already been noted, it is by no means certain that the ecstatic "fit" was accompanied by any intelligible speech. And still more, many of the oracles, as we now have them, shew signs not merely of a high degree of poetic value, but also of very considerable technical ability. An illustration may be found in the very striking oracle of Jeremiah iv. 23–26. In its original form it seems to have run .—

ראיתי את־הארץ והנה בהו
את־השמים ואין אורם
ראיתי ההרים והנם רעשים
וכל הגבעות התקלקלו
ראיתי (האדמה?) והנה אין־אדם
וכל־עוף השמים נדדו
ראיתי הכרמל והנה מדבר
וכל ערין נתצו

"The earth I saw — and lo! Chaos;
The heavens—and no light was theirs.
The mountains I saw — and lo! they quaked;
And all the hills tossed to and fro.

The land I saw — and lo! no man;
And all birds of the heavens had fled.
Carmel I saw — and lo! desert;
And all its cities a ruin.

This is one of the most perfect specimens of Hebrew poetry that we have. Both in form and in the higher qualities of poetry it is of the best that the language has to shew. Few of us would be bold enough to assert that it is the utterance of a man to whom the word "madman" could be applied—at least if it be supposed to have been spoken during the attack. And yet it is clearly the result of an ecstatic experience. The man has actually *seen* what he describes. No other hypothesis will account for the amazing vividness and impressiveness of the poem in the original. What the passage does suggest is that the prophet is here describing an ecstatic experience which is now passed, but has stamped itself most clearly upon his soul.

There are grammatical points which tend to strengthen this conclusion. Not a few of the surviving oracles are introduced by words like "said" or "saw." There are thus three types of the ecstatic experience which may be broadly distinguished from one another on psychological grounds. There are some in which the phenomena recorded are purely visual. In others again they are purely auditory, and in others both classes of experience are combined. Those of the first type are rare, but the passage just quoted offers a magnificent example. The use of the Perfect ראיתי would alone make it clear that this was a description of an event in the past, possibly the immediate past, especially when compared with the present מה אתה ראה —"what art thou now seeing?"—of Jeremiah i. 11 and 13. This last phrase, of course, occurs not at the beginning but in the course of the actual experience which is described.

We may now take those cases in which the prophet, still speaking in the first person, gives an account of an experience which is both visual and auditory. Of this we have rather more examples than of the last type. There are the two "visions" in Jeremiah i., the group of them in Amos vii.–ix., the visions of Zechariah and of Ezekiel, and, most familiar of all, the story Isaiah tells of his call to the prophetic office.

A glance at some of these may suffice. Of the five "visions" of Amos, the last is introduced, like the poem in Jeremiah just mentioned, by the word ראיתי. Clearly this points to the same conclusion as the use of the word in Jeremiah iv. 23–26. The other four Amos visions begin with the phrase כה הראני יהוה—"Yahweh gave me the following vision." No other interpretation can be assigned to this than that here also the prophet is describing an ecstatic experience which is already past and over. The same remark is applicable to the ואראה—"and I saw"—of Isaiah vi. 1. Indeed, the whole of this narrative is most instructive from this point of view. It is clear that the experience was ecstatic, though in this, as in others, the more extravagant features may have been absent. The man is in the Temple. Presumably he is looking towards the sacred emblems, though there is no suggestion of a fixed gaze such as that which stimulated the ecstasy in the case of Jeremiah and Amos. Suddenly, though the Temple walls, the altar and possibly other features of the scene remain unchanged, the whole is filled with the glory of Yahweh and His attendants. The experience is every whit as vivid as those of ordinary life—note the words ראו עיני —"my own eyes have seen." The prophet is so overwhelmed that he breaks into a cry, and is answered in clear and unmistakable fashion. In one small particular, however, the sense of reality is not quite the same as that of the

normal world, there is no suggestion that the hot stone taken from the burning altar causes any pain. Then comes the voice which he recognises as that of Yahweh Himself, and there follows conversation between them. The words of the conversation are introduced in the ordinary way with ואמר—"and I said"—and ויאמר—"and he said." The accounts of the parallel visions in Jeremiah and Amos are similar, with first a brief account of the thing seen, and then a report of the conversation.

But in some of these latter there is a new element. In Isaiah's vision the thing the prophet sees is wholly due to the ecstasy, and the vision is as much outside the normal world as the audition. But in the case of Jeremiah's testing visions and in Amos' basket of summer fruit—possibly in one or two others of that prophet—the thing seen is not part of the ecstatic experience but of the ordinary matters of life, and it is the contemplation of this which induces the ecstasy. Thus Jeremiah looks at an almond branch, and the name of the tree comes to his mind and repeats itself till it rings in his ears with a new inflection, "shoked"—for "shaked." Finally, a voice comes with a message which is based on the new word. So also the cauldron on the primitive brick or earthen stove, with the wind blowing all the smoke and reek from the northwards to the southwards. This suggests the word "blow," and the message comes that calamity will be blown[1] out of the north on Israel and Judah. Again, to Amos the sight of the קיץ—"summer fruit"— brings in time the word קץ—"end"—with the rest of the speech of Yahweh.

In the cases of these "mixed" ecstatic experiences, as in the purely visual one, what we actually have is not the contemporaneous utterance of the prophet when under the stress of the ecstasy, but the account, given later by

[1] Reading תפח for תפתח.

the prophet, of what he has seen, heard and felt in that condition. This is more obvious in Jeremiah iv. 23–26 than in the other cases, for there the word, seeing forms an essential part of the poetic form. In the other cases noted, words, saying and seeing are entirely outside any metrical scheme which will suit the passage, though it must be confessed that the poetical form is now sometimes obscure, to say the least of it.

We now turn to the type which is, as far as the record goes, purely auditory. There are a few cases in which the account of the experience is closely parallel to the last type considered. Such a case occurs in the call of Jeremiah, Jeremiah i. 4–10. It is unnecessary to go into this in detail; it is enough to point out the general similarity in form between this and the record of the "visions." The more ordinary case—and the overwhelming majority of the prophetic oracles are of this kind—is where there is no account of the circumstances whatever. The oracle, if it has any introductory words at all, is simply prefaced by the words כה אמר יהוה (E.V., "Thus saith the Lord"). For the framework to be complete the words נאם יהוה—"oracle of Yahweh"—appear at the end. In a large number of cases, however, perhaps the majority, one or other or both of these phrases are wanting. But the concluding formula appears also in Jeremiah i. 8, at the close of one of Yahweh's sentences in the conversation. The same phrase occurs—though editors doubt its originality—in Amos viii. 3—the "summer fruit" vision. And the first two of Amos' visions are closed with the similar expression אמר יהוה—"said Yahweh."

Now this introductory phrase—כה אמר יהוה—is parallel to the words with which several of the "visions" are introduced—כה הראני יהוה. The latter was seen to be probably due to a report of some experience which had

occurred previously and was now over and done with. It is surely not too much to claim that the same is true of the commoner phrase? In other words, the traditional English rendering "Thus saith the LORD" is not merely inaccurate grammatically, but misleading. "Thus hath the LORD said" is grammatical, but fails to give the right sense. We should not think of translating כה הראני יהוה by "Thus hath the LORD shewed me." The Perfect is to be treated as an Aorist—"Thus said the LORD." The phrase takes the reader back to a definite experience which is to be described, though the description may be incomplete or only partial. That is to say, that *the great majority of the prophetic oracles as we have them now are reports, possibly or even probably given by the prophet himself of what he had heard in the access of the ecstasy.*

If this be the right conclusion to draw from the facts as they are known to us, it helps us to meet another difficulty which has struck not a few scholars. This is the fact that some of the prophetic utterances, notably in the case of Isaiah, were delivered in circumstances which made it unlikely that they were accompanied by ecstatic phenomena. Such is the conversation between Ahaz and Isaiah recorded in Isaiah vii. Such also, possibly, is the conversation between Amos and Amaziah. In so far as these contain real prophetic oracles, they are oracles delivered to the prophet in the ecstatic state, and recalled and repeated by him in calmer moments. Something of the same kind may be seen in the oracles of Micaiah. These are two in number. Both are of the mixed type; in the one the prophet sees the heavenly court and hears what Yahweh and his attendants say. In the other he sees Israel scattered on the mountains as sheep that have no shepherd. But the way in which the story is told suggests that neither is actually contemporaneous with the appearance of Micaiah before Ahab. They are

experiences in the past, though not necessarily in the distant past, and they are being reported by the prophet to the king.

It is possible also that we have here an alternative explanation of some—probably not all—of the occurrences of the so-called "prophetic Perfect." It may be true in some instances that this tense is used as implying the certainty of what is prophesied, a certainty so complete that the event may be for practical purposes regarded as past. But it is also possible that from the point of view of the prophet himself it is past already. It is something which he has already experienced, and the language which he uses is a record of events which are real enough in his peculiar consciousness, that intermittent state which he describes. At the same time it must be admitted that in many passages, especially those in which the two tenses interchange, this explanation is not applicable.

There are two further points which it may be advisable to mention. One relates to the prophet's own share in his message. On the surface of the facts it might appear that he is simply a piece of recording mechanism, with no control over and no immediate interest in the things which he has to say. But whilst it is not possible to give definite proof one way or the other, the probabilities are strongly against this view. There is reason to believe that in cases of hypnotism, which has several features comparable to those of the ecstasy, it is not possible for the practitioner to make the patient perform acts which are naturally repugnant to his nature, character and point of view. Similarly, it would seem to be likely that the message to which the prophet gave utterance expressed his own real conviction. Probably he would never have delivered his message to the world of his day, unless the ecstasy had come upon him; possibly the very strength of his convictions helped to produce the

necessary condition. But it is still open to us to believe that what he had to say was in a very real sense his own, though it was necessarily the Spirit of his God that made him speak. The modes and types of inspiration must not be limited by human theory, or even by human comprehension.

The other point is to reconstruct for ourselves the actual course of events in the delivery of the individual oracle. We must assume the presence of the prophet and of a considerable number of people, as in the case of the appearance of Amos at Bethel. They may or may not be aware of the man's prophetic character when he first appears amongst them, but there is no doubt on the matter when the signs of the ecstasy appear. He may manifest the presence of the Spirit in any one of a number of ways, but whichever it is, it is clearly recognised amongst the bystanders. Their attention is attracted, and they realise at once that there is one before them who has been passing through experiences which are foreign to them. This outward turmoil is an indication of the fact that Yahweh is causing him to see or hear something which is at present hidden from the rest. Presently the ecstasy passes, and as the prophet resumes his normal appearance men begin to expect some account of what he has seen or heard. He is weak and faint; there may have been an actual struggle against the access of the Spirit. But the impulse is still strong upon him, and any attempt to refrain from speech is like shutting up a fire in his bones. So, with the instinct of a poet and a rhapsodist, he describes his experience. It may be that he has seen something strange or significant. More often it is not sight that has come to him but hearing, and he has recognised the voice that has drowned all external sounds as that of Yahweh Himself. In a few brief rhythmical sentences he gives his description, and whether the audience

believe that the message is true or not, they are sure that it is from Yahweh, and must be taken into account. The ecstasy, with its obvious attestation of the divine presence, has secured a hearing which would probably have been refused otherwise. His words are remembered, perhaps written down at once, perhaps preserved in men's minds till a later time.

It does not follow that there was always an immediate audience to witness and to hear. On the contrary, it seems most likely that in some cases the prophet is alone, or practically alone, when the thing befalls him. But he himself retains it, and can reproduce it later. He may thus utter it in the presence of the king or others of high rank, or he may repeat it to a small group of "disciples," or he may be content to write it down, and compile it and others into a book. In any case, that which is of permanent and eternal value is preserved, and the divine message through this man is handed down to later ages.

We may, then, briefly summarise the conclusions which appear to be probable from our study of this subject. Like the earlier Nabi', the Prophet was an ecstatic, and with the ecstasy had also the second sight of the ancient Seer. The ecstasy was the machinery which gave form to his message and secured for it some reception from the people of his own or a later day. The language in which the oracle has come down to us was not the prophet's utterance while actually under the stress of the ecstasy, but his account of what had passed in that other world into which he had temporarily been introduced. This account was committed to writing by the prophet himself, or by some other at a later time, and formed one of those small pieces of oracular matter of which our present prophetical books were ultimately built.

THEODORE H. ROBINSON.

ADDITIONAL NOTE ON "THE PHILOLOGY OF ST. LUKE'S PREFACE."

In the Expositor for October and November, 1920, in a paper and notes on "The Philology of St. Luke's Preface," an attempt was made to shew that the verb πληροφορεῖσθαι, literally "to be put forth in full yield" or "to put forth a full yield," denotes not a conviction or assurance of the mind, but the result of such an assurance in life and conduct, the rich fruitfulness for which the conviction prepares the way. Two passages in the Epistle to the Romans demand more attention than was given to them, and the discovery of a passage in Plutarch enables me to do more justice to them than I then could. I had long felt that the words in Romans xiv. 5, ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοΐ, challenged examination. I believe that such examination throws light on St. Paul's meaning and bears out the correctness of the force which I have suggested as belonging to πληροφορεῖσθαι. Close to the end of his Essay "On the Student at Lectures" Plutarch says :—

"The mind is not a vessel which calls for filling. It is a pile, which simply requires kindling-wood to start the flame of eagerness for original thought and ardour for truth. Suppose some one goes to borrow from his neighbour's fire, and then, on finding a large bright blaze, persists in staying and basking on the spot. It is the same when a man comes to another to borrow reason, and *does not realise that he must kindle a light of his own in the shape of thinking for himself*, but sits enchanted with enjoyment of the lecture" (p. 48 C. as translated by Prof. Tucker).

The words in italics represent the Greek οὐκ οἴεται δεῖν φῶς οἰκεῖον ἐξάπτειν καὶ νοῦν ἴδιον. St. Paul in Romans xiv. 5 says ἕκαστος ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοὶ πληροφορείσθω. He assumes that the Christian *has* a νοῦν ἴδιον, "a mind of his own," that he *has* "kindled a light of his own in the shape of thinking for himself," for he writes ἐν τῷ ἰδίῳ νοί,

using the article. What he calls on each Christian so equipped to do is to be "fully fruitful" in acting on this mind of his own, to follow out in action the principle that has been grasped with the mind, to be whole-hearted and unhesitating in letting the light which has been kindled in him shine forth in consistent conduct.

In Romans iv. 20, 21 I would suggest that there should be a comma after πληροφορηθείς, and that the following clause beginning with ὅτι depends upon ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, the two intervening participles serving to bring out all that is involved in ἐνεδυναμώθη. "He did not through unbelief waver in the face of God's promise, but, giving glory to God and shewing himself whole-hearted, he waxed strong in the faith that what God hath promised He is mighty also to do." The balance of the sentence is preserved, ὅτι ὃ ἐπήγγελται δυνατός ἐστιν καὶ ποιῆσαι attaching itself to ἐνεδυναμώθη τῇ πίστει, as εἰς τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν τοῦ θεοῦ is attached to οὐ διεκρίθη τῇ ἀπιστίᾳ. And that δοὺς δόξαν τῷ θεῷ and πληφοφορηθείς express different aspects of the same activity is felt when we read the words "Herein is My Father glorified that ye bear much fruit" (St. John xv. 8).

G. H. Whitaker.

JESUS CHRIST THE PROPITIATION FOR THE WHOLE WORLD.

"And He is the propitiation for our sins; and not for ours only, but also for the whole world."—1 JOHN ii. 2.

As a means of comforting Christians distressed by their continued lapses into sin, John, in the opening words of the second chapter of his first epistle, is led to assure them that "we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ, a Righteous One"; and by way of showing how prevailing His advocacy is, to add, "And He is Himself a propitiation for our sins." There he might well have stopped. But, without obvious necessity for his immediate purpose, he adds this great declaration: "And not for ours only, but also for the whole world." That by these words the propitiation wrought by Christ, of which we have continual need, and on which we continually draw in our need, is exalted by ascribing to it, in some sense, a universal efficacy, is clear enough. But the commentators, first and last, have not found it easy to make plain to themselves the precise nature of the universalism assigned therein to our Lord's propitiatory sacrifice.

Readers of old John Cotton's practical notes on First John, for example, will not fail to observe that he moves with a certain embarrassment in his exposition of this universalism. He has a number of things, in themselves of value, to say about it; but he appears to find most satisfaction in the suggestion that although Christ by His expiatory death has bought for His people some things—

and these the most important things—which He has not bought for all men, yet there are some most desirable things also which He has bought for all men. This, however, is certainly not what John says. It admits of no doubt that John means to say that the Christians whom he was addressing, and with whom he identifies himself—they and he alike—enjoy no privilege with reference to the propitiation of Christ, which is not enjoyed by them in common with "the whole world." They—and he with them—are not to be disheartened by their sins, he says, because these sins have been expiated by the blood of Christ; by which have been expiated indeed, not their sins only but also those of "the whole world." The "whole world" is not made in some general and subsidiary sense a beneficiary of Christ's atoning death, but in this specific and highest sense—the expiation of its sins. Its sins have been as really and fully expiated as those of the Christians John was addressing, and as his own.

The most "modern" of modern expositors are as much at sea in the face of the universalism of this assertion as any of the older and presumably less instructed ones could be. Thus Otto Baumgarten simply declines to attempt its exposition. We do not know what John means, he says; we lack the necessary information to enable us to understand him. It may sound very fine to say that John teaches here that no shadow is cast on God's holiness by the exhibition of partiality on His part for individuals; that he rebukes those who, in egotistic and sentimental religiosity, or in selfish anxiety for their own salvation, would draw apart from their fellows. But difficulties remain. Experience scarcely encourages us to think that all without exception are sharers in Christ's salvation; it rather bears out our Lord's declaration that the gate is narrow and the way straitened that leads to life and few there be that find it.

And John! Is not the whole world to him a *massa corrupta* —a "darkness" which does not "apprehend" "the light"? How we can harmonise the three passages—John i. 29, which speaks of taking away the sin of the world; John iii. 16, "God so loved the world"; and this, declaring that Christ has made propitiation for the sins of the world—with John's sharp dualism of Light and Darkness, does not appear. Perhaps John is only repeating with thoughtless neglect of their inconsequence the elements of Paul's doctrine of propitiation. Perhaps, mystical-speculative thinker that he is, he means to suggest that in Jesus' purpose or general feeling His redemption was for the whole sinful world, but only those have found in Him an actual Redeemer or Intercessor to whom He has given power to become Children of the Light. Perhaps it is, on the other hand, the missionary instinct of the Church, which declares here that no limits are to be set to the spread of salvation over the whole world—in contrast to the Gnostic confinement of it to certain gifted individuals. We can form many conjectures; we can reach no assurance.

The search for John's meaning naturally begins with an attempt to ascertain what he intends by "the world." He sets it in contrast with an "our" by which primarily his readers and himself are designated: "And He is Himself a propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for the whole world." John's readers apparently are immediately certain Christian communities in Asia Minor; and it is possible to confine the "our" strictly to them. In that case it is not impossible to interpret "the whole world," which is brought into contrast with the Christians specifically of Asia Minor, as referring to the whole body of Christians extended throughout the world. A certain measure of support for such an interpretation may be derived from such a passage as Colossians i. 6, where "the word of the

truth of the Gospel" is spoken of as "in all the world," or as Colossians i. 23, where the Gospel is said to have been "preached in all creation under heaven." In these passages the world-wide Gospel seems to be contrasted with the heresies which were troubling the Colossian Christians and which are thus branded as a merely local phenomenon. In something of the same way, the world-wide extension of the people of God may be thought to be brought into contrast by John with the local churches he is addressing; and his purpose may be supposed to be to remind these local churches that they have no monopoly of the Gospel. The propitiatory efficiency of Christ's blood is not confined to the sins of the Asian Christians, but is broad enough to meet the needs of all in like case with them throughout the whole world. Christ is no local Saviour, and all, everywhere, who confess their sins will find Him their righteous advocate, whose expiatory blood cleanses them from every sin. On this interpretation we are brought to much the same point of view as that of Augustine and Bede, of Calvin and Beza, who understand by "the whole world" "the churches of the elect dispersed through the whole world"; and by the declaration that Jesus Christ is "a propitiation for the whole world," that in His blood all the sins of all believers throughout the world are expiated.

When the assumptions on which this view of the passage is founded are scrutinised, however, they cannot be said particularly to commend themselves. John is certainly addressing a specific body of readers, and no doubt has them quite distinctively in mind when he speaks to them in the tender words, "My little children, I am writing this to you, that ye sin not." . . . But the affirmations he makes do not seem to be affirmations applicable only to them, or to be intended to be understood as spoken only of them. This is already apparent from his identifying himself with

them in these affirmations. "*We* have an Advocate," he says; "He is a propitiation for *our* sins, and not for *ours* only. . . ." If it is not impossible that he means only "you and I," "for your and my," with the strictest confinement of the "you" and "your" to those he was immediately addressing, it is nevertheless very unlikely that this is the case. He appears, on the contrary, to be reminding them of universal Christian privileges, in which they and he shared precisely for the reason that they were universally Christian. In that case the "we" and "our" refer to the whole Christian community—"we Christians" have "our, namely Christians'" sins; and "the whole world" is brought in some way into contrast with the Christian body as a whole. The strength of the assertion of universality in the contrasted phrase—"but also for *the whole* world"—falls in with this appearance. Why should the Apostle with such emphasis—why should he at all—assure his readers that the privileges they enjoyed as Christians—in common with him because they were both Christians—were also enjoyed by all other Christians,—by all other Christians throughout the whole world? Would it not be a matter of course, scarcely calling for such explicit assertion, that other Christians like themselves enjoyed the benefits of the expiatory death of their Lord? That was precisely what it was to be a Christian.

It is not surprising accordingly that the greater number of the commentators agree that the "we" of our passage is the whole body of believers, with which "the whole world" is set in contrast. That carries with it, of course, that in some sense our Lord is declared to have made propitiation not only for the sins of believers, thought of by John as actually such, but also for mankind at large. If we do not attempt the impossible feat of emptying the conception of "propitiation" of its content, this means that in some

sense what is called a "universal atonement" is taught in this passage. The expiatory efficiency of Christ's blood extends to the entire race of mankind. It may seem, then, the simplest thing just to recognise that John here represents Christ as by His atoning death expiating all the sins of all mankind—all of them without exception. This is the line of exposition which is taken, for instance, by Bernhard Weiss. "Precisely this passage shows plainly," he writes, "that the whole body of the world's sin is covered in the sight of God, that is to say expiated, by the death of Christ."

That this method of expounding the passage is not so simple, however, as it might at first sight appear, is already made clear enough by the remainder of the sentence in which Weiss gives expression to it. It runs: "What brings unbelievers to death is no longer their sin (expiated in the death of Christ), but their rejection of the divinely appointed mediator of salvation." From this it appears that the expiation of the sins of the world does not save the world. There still remain those who perish: and those who perish, as John contemplated them looking out from the bosom of the little flock of the Church, constituted the immensely greater part of mankind spread out to his view, in one word just "the world" of which he is in the act of declaring that its sins are expiated in the blood of Christ. John speaks of this expiation as a great benefit brought to the world by Christ, or, to put it in its true light, as *the* great benefit, in comparison with which no other benefit deserves consideration. Yet it would puzzle us to point out of what benefit it is to the world. The world, to all appearance, remains precisely as it was before. It is very clear that the world was not conceived by John as a redeemed world. We are not to love it, nor the things in it. We are rather to renounce it, as an inimical power. Nay, John

declares roundly that the whole world—this whole world which we are invited to think of as having had all its sins expiated by the blood of Christ—"lieth in the evil one." It is difficult to understand how a world all whose sins have been, and are continually as they emerge being—for that is the force of the representation—washed away in the blood of Christ, can still be lying in the evil one; that is to say, as A. Plummer expounds this declaration, still "remains in the power" of the evil one, "has not passed over, as Christians have done, out of death into life; but abides in the evil one, who is its ruler, as the Christian abides in Christ." What we are asked to believe is nothing less than that the John who places the world and Christian in directly contrary relations to Christ, nevertheless in our present passage places them in precisely the same relation to Christ. Nor is it easy to understand what can be meant by saying that men, all whose sins, as they occasionally emerge ("and He *is*," not *was*, "a propitiation") are covered from the sight of God by the death of Christ, nevertheless perish; and that because of rejection of the divinely appointed mediator of salvation. Is not the rejection of Jesus as our propitiation a sin? And if it is a sin, is it not like other sins, covered by the death of Christ? If this great sin is excepted from the expiatory efficacy of Christ's blood, why did not John tell us so, instead of declaring without qualification that Jesus Christ is the propitiation for our sins, and not for ours only but for the whole world? And surely it would be very odd if the sin of rejection of the Redeemer were the only condemning sin, in a world the vast majority of the dwellers in which have never heard of this Redeemer, and nevertheless perish. On what ground do they perish, all their sins having been expiated?

The expedient made use of by many commentators in their endeavour to escape from this maze of contradictions

is to distinguish between Christ as our "Advocate" and Christ as our "Propitiation," and to connect actual salvation with Him only in the former function. Thus Richard Rothe tells us that "the propitiation in Christ concerns the whole world," but "only those in Christ have an Advocate in Christ," with the intimation that it is Christ's Advocacy which "makes the efficacy of His propitiation effective before God." In this view the propitiation is conceived as merely laying a basis for actual forgiveness of sins, and is spoken of therefore rather as "sufficient" than efficacious—becoming efficacious only through the act of faith on the part of the believer by which he secures Christ as his Advocate. This is the view presented by B. F. Westcott also, according to whom Christ is advocate exclusively for Christians, while He is a propitiation for the whole world. His propitiatory death on earth was for all men; His advocacy in heaven is for those only who believe in Him. Here, there is a universal atonement taught, with a limited application, contingent on actual faith: "the efficacy of His work for the individual depends upon fellowship with Him."

It is obvious that such a view can be held only at the cost of emptying the conception of propitiation of its properly expiatory content, and shifting the really saving operation of Christ from His "atoning" death on earth to His "intercession" in heaven. Westcott carries this whole programme fully out, and by a special doctrine of "sacrifice," of "blood" and its efficacy, and of "the heavenly High Priesthood of Christ" systematises this point of view into a definite scheme of doctrine. No support is given this elaborate construction by John; and our present passage is enough to shatter the foundation on which it is built, in common with many other constructions sharing with it the general notion that the atonement is

to be conceived as universal while its application is particular, and that we may therefore speak of the sins of the whole world as expiated while believers only enjoy the benefits of this expiation. The "advocacy" of our Lord is indeed based here on His propitiation. But it is based on it not as if it bore merely an accidental relation to it, and might or might not, at will, follow on it; but as its natural and indeed necessary issue. John introduces the declaration that Christ is—not "was," the propitiation is as continuous in its effect as the advocacy—our propitiation, in order to support his reference of sinning Christians to Christ as their Advocate with the Father, and to give them confidence in the efficacy of His advocacy. The efficacy of the advocacy rests on that of the propitiation, not the efficacy of the propitiation on that of the advocacy. It was in the propitiatory death of Christ that John finds Christ's saving work: the advocacy is only its continuation—its unceasing presentation in heaven. The propitiation accordingly not merely lays a foundation for a saving operation, to follow or not follow as circumstances may determine. It itself saves. And this saving work is common to Christians and "the whole world." By it the sins of the one as of the other are expiated, that is to say, as Weiss wishes to express it in Old Testament forms of speech, are "covered in the sight of God." They no longer exist for God—and are not they blessed whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered, to whom the Lord will not reckon sin? It is idle to talk of expounding this passage until we are ready to recognise that according to its express assertion the "whole world" is saved. Its fundamental assumption is that all those for whose sins He is—"is," not "was"—the propitiation have in Him an Advocate with the Father, prevailingly presenting His "righteousness" to the Father and thereby securing their salvation.

This is, of course, universalism. And it is in determining the precise nature of the universalism that it is, that we arrive at last at John's real meaning. In declaring that Jesus Christ is a propitiation for the whole world, John certainly does not mean to assert that Christ has made expiation for all the sins of every individual man who has come or will come into being, from the beginning of the race in Adam to its end at the last day. Baumgarten-Crusius seems to stand almost alone in expressly emphasising the protensive aspect of the "world"; and he does it in order to avoid admitting that John means to present Christ as the Saviour of the whole world extensively considered. John means only, he says, that Christ is a Saviour with abiding power for the whole human era; all through the ages He is mighty to save, though He saves only His own. It is much more common silently to assume that by "the whole world" John has in mind the whole race of mankind throughout the entire range of its existence in time: few have the hardihood openly to assert it. It is ordinarily taken for granted (Huther is one of the few who give it explicit expression) that "John was thinking directly of the 'world' as it existed in his time." Huther indeed adds the words: "without however limiting the idea to it," and thus suggests that John was thinking of the "world" protensively as well as extensively, without explicitly saying so. Clearly in any event it would be impossible to attribute to John teaching to the effect that Christ's expiatory work concerned only those who happened to be living in His own—or in John's—generation. This would yield a conception of the range of the propitiatory efficacy of our Lord's death which can be looked upon only as grotesque. Yet there is nothing in John's language to justify the attribution to him of a protensive conception of "the whole world" in the sense of the universalists. It seems quite clear that, by "the

whole world," he means primarily the world extensively conceived. It is equally clear, however, that he means neither to confine the efficacy of Christ's blood to his own generation, nor to maintain that the entirety of contemporary humanity was saved. He knew of those not of his own time who were saved; he knew of children of the devil in his own day. There is a protensive element in his conception of the world. It is however of its protension in the future rather than in the past that he is thinking. He sees the world not only lying on every side of him in space, but very especially as stretching out before him in time. The contrast between it and the little flock of Christians includes thus a contrast of times.

The interpretation of our passage has suffered seriously from a mechanical treatment of its language. We must permit to John the flexibility customary among men in the handling of human speech. When he speaks of Christ as a propitiation "for the whole world," we cannot either confine his language rigidly to the world of his own day, or expand it with equal rigidity to the extremest limit of the possible connotation of the phrase. He is certainly intending to present Christ as a world-wide Saviour by whom nothing less than the world is saved; but it does not follow that he means to affirm that therefore no single man of all who ever live in the world is omitted. He is obviously thinking in the terms of the great phrase he is himself a little later to use, when he declares that the Father has sent the Son "as Saviour of the world." To him Jesus Christ is very expressly the Saviour of the whole world: He had come into the world to save not individuals merely, out of the world, but the world itself. It belongs therefore distinctly to His mission that He should take away the sin of the world. It is this great conception which John is reflecting in the phrase, "He is the propitiation for our sins, and

not for ours only but for the whole world." This must not be diluted into the notion that He came to offer salvation to the world, or to do His part toward the salvation of the world, or to lay such a basis for salvation that it is the world's fault if it is not saved. John's thinking does not run on such lines; and what he actually says is something very different, namely that Jesus Christ is a propitiation for the whole world, that He has expiated the whole world's sins. He came into the world because of love of the world, in order that He might save the world, and He actually saves the world. Where the expositors have gone astray is in not perceiving that this salvation of the world was not conceived by John—any more than the salvation of the individual—as accomplishing itself all at once. Jesus came to save the world, and the world will through Him be saved; at the end of the day He will have a saved world to present to His Father. John's mind is running forward to the completion of His saving work; and he is speaking of his Lord from the point of view of this completed work. From that point of view He is the Saviour of the world.

Conceptions like those embodied in the Parables of the Mustard Seed and the Leaven lay at the back of John's mind. He perfectly understood that the Church as it was phenomenally present to his observation was but "a little flock." He as perfectly understood that it was after a while to cover the whole world. And therefore he proclaims Jesus the Saviour of the world and declares Him a propitiation for the whole world. He is a universalist; he teaches the salvation of the whole world. But he is not an "each and every" universalist: he is an "eschatological" universalist. He teaches the salvation of the world through a process; it may be—it has proved to be—a long process; but it is a process which shall reach its goal. It is not then "our" sins only which Jesus has expiated—the sins of the "little

flock," now living within the range almost of John's physical vision. He has expiated also the sins of "the whole world"; and at the end, therefore, we shall see nothing less than a world saved by Him. The contrast between the "our" and "the world" in John's mind, therefore, is at bottom the contrast between the smallness of the beginnings and the greatness of the end of the Christian development. And what his declaration is, at its core, is thus only another of those numerous—prophecies, shall we say? or assertions? —which meet us throughout the Apostolic teaching, of the ultimate conquest of the world by Christ. Christ, he tells his "little flock," is the "propitiation for our sins"; in Him "we" have found a full salvation. But he is not willing to stop there. His glad eyes look out on a saved world. "And not for ours only," he adds, "but also for the whole world." We are a "little flock" now: to-morrow we shall be the world. We are but the beginnings: the salvation of the world is the end. And it is not this only, but that, that Christ has purchased with His precious blood. The light that is perceptible now only within the narrow limits of the "little flock" has in it a potency of illumination which no bounds can confine: it, "the real light," is "already shining"—and before it John sees "the darkness" already "passing away." It is not merely a world-wide Gospel with which he knows himself entrusted: it is a world-wide salvation which he is called to proclaim. For Jesus Christ is the Saviour not of a little flock merely, but of the world itself: and the end to which all things are working together is nothing other than a saved world. At the end of the day there will stand out in the sight of all a whole world, for the sins of which Christ's blood has made effective expiation, and for which He stands as Advocate before the Father.

BENJAMIN B. WARFIELD.

JEREMIAH AND THE ESSENCE OF RELIGION.

Early in his prophetic career Jeremiah develops with precision and force his view of that repentance which to him constitutes the basis of true religion, in iii. 1–iv. 3. The series of oracles has been slightly dislocated by the intrusion of a passage belonging to a later date, viz., iii. 6–18. When the thought is seen to run on from iii. 1–5 to iii. 19–iv. 3, the significance and purpose of the whole become clearer.

The first oracle contains a sharp criticism of the people's religious attitude, which the prophet regards as due to a radical inability to recognise the character of the God it worships. Using Hosea's favourite figure of the relation between husband and wife to illustrate the relation between Yahweh and Israel, he says, "Suppose a man has been compelled to divorce his wife and she has left him to go to another man, will he go back to her at a word? is not that woman defiled?[1] But thou hast gone after many lovers, and yet a return to Me is a thing of course." It is somewhat unfortunate that an explanation of this simple utterance has been sought in Deuteronomy xxiv. 1–4 and the regulations which determined the practice of divorce in early Israel, or that it should be counted necessary to discuss the legal conditions under which an Israelite was permitted to take back his divorced wife. The supposed reference to the law of divorce has naturally made it seem advisable to alter "will he return to her" into "may she return to him,"[2] since the legal difficulties lay in the return of the divorced woman to her husband. But any change is seen to be unnecessary, as soon as it is recognised that Jeremiah is not

[1] Read with LXX אשה for ארץ, because otherwise הֲהִיא is inexplicable.

[2] To appeal to the LXX in support of this change is, to say the least, dubiously justifiable, *μὴ ἀνακάμπτουσα ἀνακάμψει πρὸς αὐτόν* is a questionable equivalent of הֲתָשׁוּב אֵלָיו.

appealing to any law at all, but simply speaking to the natural instincts of common men. He is asking men whether, in the intimate relations of their ordinary life, they would act with the same disregard to moral feeling as they unthinkingly practise in relation to their God. Will any one of them take back, without some evidence of change on her part, a woman whom he had been obliged to divorce? The thing is not done. Thereupon he presses his argument *a majore* on the men he addresses. Yahweh never put Israel away; she went of her own choice. Nor did she confine herself to a single infidelity, her gods are as numerous as her whims. Let her only look round her, verse 2, at the many heights, where the altars to the strange gods stand; and it will become evident how the land reeks with her infidelities. Yet, in spite of all this, the people dream that it is natural and easy, without moral effort or seriousness of purpose, that there should be a return to Yahweh.

Not only had Yahweh dealt faithfully with Israel, but He had not failed to warn her of the inevitable outcome of her conduct. He had not left her without a reminder, for the rains had been withheld from the polluted land which refused its fruits, verse 3. But every warning was useless, since Israel had a forehead of brass,[1] and rejected all correction.

Not that Israel had any desire to break off all relation to Yahweh; they did not even believe that their giving a certain recognition to other gods involved a rupture with Him. Even in these circumstances (מֵעַתָּה), says Jeremiah, thou continuest to call Yahweh "my husband,[2] the friend

[1] Generally אשה is omitted, cf. B.H., as a gloss on זוֹנָה, but it is difficult to see how even the densest glossator could suppose it necessary to say that a זונה was a woman. זונה is the gloss, glossed on אשה after that word had been corrupted out of נִחַשָּׁה. When אשה came to stand alone, it needed a gloss. Cf. Ehrlich *ad loc.*

[2] There need be no difficulty about construing אבי, nor is it necessary to change it, as Rothstein proposes, into בַּעֲלִי. For abū is used in Baby-

of my youth." He remains to the people the good old Hebrew God, the God of their fathers, the God who brought them out of the land of Egypt; only this recognition and acknowledgment of Him on their part seem quite compatible with a certain place being given to other gods. They have no idea of devoting their entire allegiance to Him. He remains as one who has eminent claims upon them, but who takes His place among the other objects of their devotion. There seems to them to be nothing inconsistent in their giving Him an eminent place in their worship, while they also reverence the new modern deities which have crept into the high places. It is true that He is austere and shows Himself angry at times, withholding the rains and sending drought in His sudden anger, but He does not keep His anger long, verse 5. Above all, there is no need for any moral effort on their part to avert such anger, it passes as it has risen. You talk after this fashion, says Jeremiah, and you act disloyally, and you are able to combine and bear the two together, verse 5, but can Yahweh bear them ?

Jeremiah goes straight to the root of what is making the people incapable of realising the need for any spiritual change and moral effort. It is their radical incapacity to realise the unique and spiritual character of God. So long as they fail to realise that Yahweh has a character, which is all His own, which sets Him apart in lonely dignity from all the other objects of man's devotion, they will see no reason why He should not take His place among these, perhaps having a special claim upon Israel, but yet not excluding other gods. Taking His place there among the rest, He may be angry at times, if He does not receive His due; but His anger is lightly turned aside without a strenuous and radical repent-

lonian of a husband (Barton, *Semitic Origins*, p. 68, n. 5) and in both North and South Semitic dialects the husband can be called the father of his wife. (W. Robertson Smith, *Kinship and Marriage*, pp. 117 f.)

ance. So long, too, as men fail to recognise that Yahweh has a character which is not only His own, but which is the expression of His nature, and therefore immutable, they will fail to recognise that He can only come to men who are prepared to meet Him along the lines of His demand. His demand does not lie in something which He chooses and can therefore in certain circumstances forego ; it lies in what He is and cannot but continue to be. For any man or nation to enter into relation to Him implies accepting the conditions that are laid down in His nature. And this implies an allegiance as absolute and unique as is the character of the God to whom it is rendered. Religion means the submission to Yahweh on His own terms, and His terms are simply the expression of what He is.

One hears the same note in Hosea, when he quoted, vi. 1–3, a passage from one of his people's penitential hymns, and followed it by a demand for true repentance. There too the people speak of how Yahweh has smitten and has healed, of how He may be angry for two days but will return and relent on the third without any need for special contrition on their part. His coming is as sure as any process of nature, like the return of the dawn or the arrival of the summer rain ; like these also, it is unconditioned by moral and spiritual considerations. He comes as the rain comes, which falls on the just and unjust alike. Hosea follows up the hymn with a demand for repentance, because it is his task to say that Yahweh's coming cannot be like the rain, precisely because it is morally conditioned. He can only come in benediction to men who are prepared to receive Him and who have prepared to receive Him by a sincere repentance which recognises what He must be and what, being that which He is, He must demand.

Both prophets base their monotheism, not on the barren conception that Yahweh is one, but on the fruitful con-

ception that He is unique. He has a character which sets Him apart from everything else that men were worshipping as God. Hence He cannot demand a little less or a little more of the devotion of His worshippers. He claims everything. To admit another claim from another god is to deny the lonely and sufficient character of Yahweh. He is not claiming His rights when He refuses to share His honour with another, He is merely declaring what He is.

Both prophets, too, show the singular uplift of the whole nature which follows on admitting one supreme allegiance in life. They are conscious of how life is simplified, and the nature of a man unified and steeled, when he rises up to face a single and an ultimate claim upon him. Yahweh's character conditions all His actions, and to acknowledge this character and surrender to Him on His terms make all life simple and direct, because unified. Self-surrender to the will of Yahweh seems a slight thing in itself, but, since in reality it presents a tremendous claim, it brings a resultant greatness, for it makes the whole life of one piece.

So far Jeremiah seems to close with a declaration of how there can be no return of his people to their God. It is, however, merely a declaration of how there can be no return unless the people recognise who it is to whom they are to return. With the thoughts men have about God and their relation to Him, with the resultant thoughts of how to find Him, they may find something but will never find Yahweh. Being what He is, He must have everything or nothing, He can and will accept no divided allegiance.

Now the prophet turns to speak of Yahweh Himself and of His treatment of the people, as contrasted with their treatment of Him. "It was in My mind to treat Israel as a son," iii. 19. Here, again, it appears an unfortunate following of a false trail to refer, as Peake e.g. does, to Numbers xxvii. 1–8, the incident about the daughters of Zelophehad,

the son of Hepher, in which it is related how they claimed, since their father had left nothing but daughters, to be put on the same footing as sons in the question of the inheritance of land. So to do is to involve oneself, and, what is more serious, to involve Jeremiah in the intricacies of Israelite law about inheritance of landed property as well as in the practice of their divorce court ; and it further brings with it the question of how far a prophet could or would put the "inheritance" of Palestine by Israel on the same level as the "inheritance" of land by a son in succession to his dead father. Surely Jeremiah was not wading among legal subtleties, but thinking about something much simpler and far more direct. As a matter of fact, the language he employs is capable of a much more simple application, for "to set among the sons" is plain Hebrew for "to treat like a son." [1] It is as unnecessary to discuss Hebrew law of inheritance in connexion with the words as it is to raise the question whether Jeremiah believed Yahweh to have other sons as well as Israel. That matter, also, was not present to the mind of the prophet at all. He is still following his great forerunner, Hosea, who spoke of how Yahweh called His son, Israel, out of Egypt, xi. 1. Having given Israel the status of a son, and given it life out of Egypt, He also gave the people its delightsome land, its superb possession among the heathen world. Yahweh did not confine His benefits to words, but, because of His delight in Israel, He gave it a special dignity which made it to be marked and remarkable as His peculiar people. He expected accordingly that Israel should make as vital and active a response, and, since He had acknowledged it as His son alone in the world, should give Him the reverence that is due to a father and to a father alone. Instead of such a response, the people

[1] Cf., e.g., Ps. cxviii. 7 : יהוה לִי בְּעֹזְרָי, Yahweh is among my helpers, merely means Yahweh is mine aid.

betrayed Him, as an unfaithful wife betrays her husband for the sake of a lover.[1]

Jeremiah is urging the same subject from another side, with closer insistence on the past of Israel. All that the nation has it owes to Yahweh : its being and its well-being alike are due to His peculiar and constant care. Without Him it would have been nothing, but through what He has been to it, it has been proved His son. Gratitude alone should have been sufficient to make evident His special claim on their devotion. They should have given all to Him who had grudged nothing to them, but neither the recognition of what He is in Himself, nor the intimate knowledge of what He has shown Himself to them has been sufficient to retain their allegiance to their God.

Is that then the end, and has all the travail of the past resulted in futility ? It might well seem so, but is not so to Jeremiah. He has heard and seen something else besides the vulgar worship on the heights. "Hark, on the bare heights I hear the wailing of the children of Israel, because they have wilfully gone astray and put out of mind Yahweh their God. See, we are still Thine,[2] for Thou art Yahweh our God. Surely the tumult[3] of the hills, the riot of the mountains has proved itself a lie ; surely in Yahweh our God is help for Israel."

But what does the prophet mean ? Perhaps one is helped to understand if one thinks of him, as he was, a child of his

[1] מֵרֵעָהּ : retain and translate as above. Rothstein, following the versions, changes to מִבַּעְלָהּ, i.e., betrays her husband. But רע is used for lover, not husband, at ver. 1 : and it is scarcely legitimate to employ the word in two such different senses in one passage.

[2] Probably, though not necessarily, read with Syr. חִנָּה אֲנַחְנוּ לָךְ. The reading has this advantage that it brings out the familiar combination, Israel a people for Yahweh, Yahweh the God of Israel.

[3] As Driver points out, the Hebrew would not say "hills are false," but would state what on the hills is false. The parallelism with "riot of the mountains" suggests a word like tumult, as above.

own nation, bred on its soil, saturated with its genius and specially with its religion, proud of its traditions, disciplined by its history, conscious of how its past and its religion have moulded his nature and his outlook. He himself is sick at heart over the empty sensuous worship of his time, the riot on the mountains. He knows it all to be alien to the finest spirit which his nation has nurtured in him, and he cannot believe that he is alone in his weariness and disgust. So to think about himself, as though he alone were capable of such revolt, would be to erect himself on an arrogant pedestal which is alien to his simple nature. What he feels of nausea and revolt, just because he feels it as a man of Judah through his national training, cannot be unknown to many others in Judah besides himself. So a Scotsman, in the cosmopolitan crowd of one of our modern cities, may feel surge up within him a bitter longing for the naked moors and the stinted fare and the narrow, gallant heroisms on which he was reared. And, because he seemed to himself to fall back not on himself, but on all that was best and simplest in the land that bred him, he would know that his revolt was not his own, but that of many who had not denied, and could not deny, their national heritage.

What Jeremiah hears is the soul of his nation, misled, bewildered, dazzled, yet not wholly alienated from its God. Above all, it betrays, almost unconsciously to itself, how much of a hold Yahweh still has upon its life, because it cannot be satisfied with the poor solace and strength which the coarse semi-pagan worship of its time can offer. Israel cannot rejoice with the abandon which the other nations show, for it no longer sits so close to nature as the other nations, having recognised the meaning of morality. The voice which the prophet hears is the voice every preacher must be able to hear, who is to go on preaching, especially in such a time as that in which Jeremiah lived. He must

believe that there are men who are capable of welcoming and understanding his message, or he will soon surrender the task of preaching a message in which only he himself is interested. For, while the prophet may well be conscious that he is in the secret of the Lord, he must also be conscious that the thing he learns there is not his exclusive property. It must be communicable to other men, and, if it is to be so, it must have its point of contact with their lives and with their consciences. Even because it is the Lord's word and not his own, it is also other men's. The more it has comforted and stayed up his own heart in untoward days, the more confident does he become that there are multitudes who can share it and will exult to hear it, since it will speak to their case also.

From the early prophets and occasionally from the historical books it is possible to obtain many a glimpse of what the riot on the mountains meant. It is possible to piece together some picture of the crowds drawn by mixed motives who went on pilgrimage to the favourite shrines, of the songs, the dancing, the feasting, the mixture of fair and religious festival, the night scenes when the special services of the day were past. And matters must have become very much worse in Jeremiah's time. Wars and corrupt government had wasted the country and had brought about the impoverishment and the coarsening of the peasantry who formed the backbone of Hebrew life. Through the captivity which had transformed North Israel into a satrapy and through the heavy blows inflicted and the crushing tribute imposed by the foreigner, Judah had especially lost its national pride and self-confidence. As its religion had always been in very close contact with its sense of national character and national dignity, men, through losing sense of their nation's distinctive worth, were losing hold of what gave the people distinction and character,

their religion. They were sinking back into one of the little Semitic principalities of Syria, which cowered together before the colossus on the Euphrates or conspired together when there seemed a chance of casting off the hated yoke. One among the many in a common fate of subjection, they began to assimilate the spirit of that world in which they were submerged. Men, having lost confidence in themselves and in their national faith, imported foreign superstitions which might cover their nakedness or deaden their misery. Or they fell back on every sort of baser superstition, which in better days the virile faith in Yahweh had driven underground and kept out of sight. Cults and habits which they might hitherto have despised began to be welcomed; there might be something in them. The old memories of their national past ceased to move or appeal to the multitude, they were too austere and restrained to satisfy their jaded palates. Others found these memories, bringing their contrast with the present, too bitter to be borne. They tried to make up for the rich inspiring joy of the past by plunging into the coarse superstitions and the bestialities which are apt to come to the surface in every period of national weakness and hopelessness.

Was Jeremiah wrong, when he believed that the riot on the mountains was only the louder because men were trying to make themselves believe in it? Was he wrong when he believed that many an honest farmer in Judah looked on at these scenes with a heavy and troubled heart? Was he a wholly false interpreter of his nation's character and destiny, when he believed that these things did not represent the true soul of his people and could not permanently content them? There were men there, he thought, who had drunk in like wine the sweet, strong words of Amos' passion and Hosea's demand, into whose blood had passed that new estimate of what gives life its worth which made it impossible

for Israel ever to abandon itself to pagan joy like the nations round it. Yahweh had His hand on them, whether they would or not. And such men were deeply conscious of the contrast between the scenes which expressed their national faith, and that stern, bracing discipline of soul which the Yahweh religion alone could bring. Verily in Yahweh our God is the salvation of Israel. All Israel's later history down even to our own day is the proof that the prophet read the temper of his people aright.

But to these broken, dissatisfied men their estate seemed hopeless. The memory of Yahweh and of what faith in Him could and did do is useless. All it can produce now is to poison their peace in the present and to give a hopeless remorse about the past. For their prevailing sense is that of moral impotence. Ever since we can remember, this baal-worship has eaten up the toil, devoured the vigour, of our fathers; let us lie down in our shame, verse 24 f. The falsity of their relation to God has eaten out of them and their nation the power to turn with hope and lay hold on that which is better. Their own sin and the sin of their fathers have contributed to destroy in the souls of men the power to hold fast the higher thing which yet they cannot help desiring. Let our dishonour cover us, for since the beginning we and our fathers have alike sinned against Yahweh.

It seems unnecessary to remove any part of this plaintive confession and relegate it to that convenience of Old Testament criticism, the Post-exilic Period. It is true, of course, that the later period was very much interested in the sins of the fathers and referred to these with great frequency. But one can hardly make the fact of the post-exilic generation being deeply interested in the sins of the fathers a reason for supposing that nobody else could also give a passing thought to the subject. Especially does this ready method of disposing of the matter seem unjustified when, as in this case,

it becomes clear that the subject is being regarded from a totally different point of view. The men of the post-exilic period were generally, if not entirely, interested in the guilt of the past, because it seemed to supply a reason for the punishment of the present. Israel, in its continued exile, was being required to expiate the guilt of all its past. But here the sins of the past are recognised as contributing to the moral weakness of the present—a very different situation. The post-exilic time was seeking some explanation for a difficult fact, and sadly recognising that no nation is permitted, in the awful Providence of God, to make a clean break and begin anew, as though it had no history. Partly in self-excuse, partly in explanation of the supposed delays in its God's mercy, it was recognising how the present inherits for good and ill the defects of a forgotten time. Jeremiah was not seeking the explanation of anything, he was stating a very actual reality, how the evil in which men have been bred, the false thoughts of God and the slack habits in which they have been reared, dull the conscience of a nation and deaden the springs of its moral resilience. The baal-worship had eaten out the power of the people to respond to every moral and spiritual appeal, its power to react to a new conviction, and it had eaten that out the more because it did not begin its foul work yesterday.

To such men, powerless to advance or to stand still, Jeremiah addresses his last sentences in the verses in ch. iv. The first verse here seems capable of a perfectly straightforward interpretation as it stands. I cannot but think that most of the interpreters have created for themselves the difficulty which they find in it. Their difficulty is in the double meaning which they conceive Jeremiah to have given to the word "return," שוב. It seems to them to mean both restoration from exile and repentance toward God, and certainly it is difficult to believe that the prophet would use

the same word in one clause and mean two different things by it. But does he speak about a return from exile at all ? If he did, would not his demand, if it was addressed to North Israel, have been a grim sarcasm, since the poor wretches were not out of their land by their own will and could not come back, except with their captors' consent ? What reason then to make their captivity more bitter by assuring them that only by their return, which was beyond their power, could they hope to return to their God ? And, if the reference is to the greater captivity under Babylon, then the summons must be uttered to the men who were free to return after Cyrus' edict but did not ; in which case we have another post-exilic gloss.

But surely, if we take the word to mean what it has meant through the entire section, i.e. repentance, it falls exactly into line with all the rest of Jeremiah's thought. In iii. 25 he is full of sympathy and heartache over weary and defeated men, who are profoundly conscious of their worse than folly in forsaking their allegiance to Yahweh, and who are as profoundly conscious of how the only hope of new life for their nation is in Him. Yet they are defeated, life-weary men who believe they have no longer the courage or the moral vigour to make a fresh effort. And Jeremiah, with his heart yearning over them, yet with a clear sense of how wantonly wrong they are, demands precisely the fresh effort. They must not stand where they are, exposed to all the dreary perils which attend the empty heart and disquieted conscience. If they have it in their mind to return, to Me they are to return. The position of אֵלַי is emphatic, because the emphasis lies on " Me," Yahweh, the source of their self-disgust, the source also of their new hope. What Jeremiah is insisting on is the possibility and the simplicity of a right repentance, if men will only make it with singleness of purpose. He is conscious of the moral peril and spiritual

hopelessness of the life which has outgrown or become dissatisfied with all its false worships, but which has not yet found rest in turning to the higher. He is also urging on them the recognition of how Yahweh, who calls insistently for repentance, makes its issue sure. It is the flavour of the Yahweh religion, lingering in the nation's life and in these men's thought, which has made it impossible for them to remain as the votaries of a baser worship. Let them, in leaving the false with disgust, close with the true, which has emptied the false to them of all content. To Me ye may or ye must or ye can return.

"And, if ye remove your false gods out of My presence, do not then go wandering." Probably, though not necessarily, we should follow the Septuagint, and, omitting ו before לֹא and joining מִפָּנַי to לֹא, translate "if ye remove your false gods, from My presence do not go astray, i.e., do not remain with none." The slight change has a double advantage. It puts the emphasis on "out of My presence" precisely as the previous clause put the emphasis on "unto Me." It also recalls how Cain describes himself (Genesis iv. 14) as a wanderer (נָד), hid from God's presence (מִפָּנֶיךָ), and so helps to meet Driver's difficulty about using נוד in a moral, not a physical, sense.[1]

What Jeremiah fears and warns men against is the moral peril and weakness involved in mere regret with its barren pain. The only wholesome regret is that which drives men to escape from it into a right relation to Yahweh. Life to the prophet does not come out of regrets, however sincere or tender; it comes only through positive resolutions. Regret can only lead to a deepened sense of impotence through the recognition of that from which men have fallen and of the

[1] Driver, because of this difficulty, proposed to read תָּרוּד, cf. ii. 31, and to translate "roam at large." Apart from the above reference to Cain the use of נוד in a moral sense seems to me to be guaranteed by Ps. lvi. 9, no matter to what date one assigns the Psalm.

depth of the fall. Regret may even lead to a species of luxurious hypochondria which is a threatened death to the soul. The first and last condition of a true repentance consists in a return to God. In the very act lies a fresh spring of force and hope. Even to see God, to realise His presence in life, to set a soul at gaze before the wonder and the glory of His presence, is to find the streams of a new hope steal through the soul. Unto Me shall ye return. But, O ye men of Judah and inhabitants of Jerusalem, make clean work, break up the fallow ground and take heed not to sow among thorns (verse 3).[1]

Cornill regards verses 3 f. as reaching the highest point in all the prophetic literature, but rejects verse 1, mainly because he regards the demand it contains as trivial in relation to the needs of the situation. So far as his view concerns the idea of demanding a return to God, his opinion of its triviality implies, I venture to think, far too slight a sense of the positive character of Yahweh, as that was developed by Jeremiah and by his great teacher, Hosea. To Hosea and to Jeremiah after him Yahweh was the source of all life, physical and moral, in Israel. His relation to Israel was always that of an active benefactor, bringing out of the riches of His love fresh benefits. The right attitude of Israel to Him involved an active beneficence toward one's fellow-Israelites, which makes Hosea's ethics unique in the Old Testament, in that with him alone do they become positive. Because the thought of God is so positive, to repent in such a way as to be brought into contact with Him is so fruitful a thought to Jeremiah.

Indeed, it may be said, as against Cornill, that, unless one

[1] Verse 2, with its resemblance to Gen. xii. 3 and xviii. 18, seems to me secondary in its character. I acknowledge, however, that the argument based on resemblance is a dubious one. Jeremiah's glossator may have borrowed from Genesis, but the writer in Genesis may have borrowed from Jeremiah.

can retain verse 1, verses 3 f. by themselves become rather barren of content. Break up the fallow ground and do not sow among thorns. Very true, but what is it that Jeremiah would have his people sow there? It is the weakness of all the moralists that they fail to supply this to their generation, and so leave the ploughed lea and the weeded garden without a crop. And it is, on the other hand, the strength of all the great prophets that they were more than moralists, even religious men, and that they had learned first and could declare afterwards how to be with their God was to find a source of perennial, wholesome, joyous activity. The soul, according to Jeremiah, needs no more for its restoration and for its stability than God. Only it must make clean work, and when it returns, must return to Him, with no *arrière pensée* and with nothing kept back. Religion to him becomes a source of comfort, invigoration and freshness of hope, when it means self-surrender. The spirit, in surrendering to God, commits itself to One in whom is the secret of every renewal.

Jeremiah, throughout the passage, develops his thought positively with no polemic except that which he uttered against the bastard mixture of nature and moral religion, of Baalism and Yahwism, which he found current among his people. But it is interesting to recognise how, when he uttered these words, another polemic against the same bastard religion was in preparation in Jerusalem. The men behind the Deuteronomic reformation were about to remove the very high places which produced the riot of the mountains because they were as thoroughly convinced as the prophet that the worship there was sapping the moral fibre and weakening the spiritual force of their people. They said, however, that there was needed for right religion a correct ritual performed by priests who had the Levitical succession and who carried it out in one place. So soon as they said

this, they improved their religion, but they made the religion they improved their own, the Jewish religion for all time.

The prophet says nothing about Jerusalem or a temple, or sacrifices or a priesthood. That he can speak about religion without speaking about them or about any of them, is the sufficient proof that they were at best secondary in his thoughts. What is primary in his thought, what, being primary, can stand alone, what, being fundamental and singularly fertile, can develop its own helps and gather its own accessories and construct its own ritual, is a right repentance on the part of man and a God who receives the penitent. Out of these can spring everything else, as in these is the source of everything.

Because Jeremiah is conceiving of religion as having two primary poles, God and the penitent spirit, he sits a little loose to Judaism and may yet find his situation difficult with those earnest men who are planning a reformation along very different lines. For the religion of which he speaks to his people comes within the reach of any man who can reach such a thought of Yahweh's nature and Yahweh's demands as has come to Israel through its historic revelation. Since his thought was so wide in its scope, Jeremiah might very naturally believe that Yahweh had called him to be a prophet, not merely to Israel, but to the nations.

ADAM C. WELCH.

THE ODES OF SOLOMON AND THE BIBLICAL TARGUMS.

In the present paper I am proposing to discuss the dependence of the *Odes of Solomon* upon the Biblical Targums, especially upon the Targum on the Psalms and the Targum on Isaiah. Something has been said upon the point in the recent edition of the *Odes* issued by the John Rylands Library, under the editorial care of my colleague Dr. Mingana and myself; but, as we shall see presently, the treatment of the *Odes* from this point of view in the new edition is rather to be described as suggestive than to be regarded as exhaustive and final. At first sight it might seem that an attempt to elucidate the *Odes of Solomon* by means of a Targum was almost like explaining *ignotum per ignotius;* for, after all, what do we know of those Aramaic translations of the Old Testament which go under the name of Targum? Their origin and time of production are still involved in obscurity; there is, probably, no branch of Biblical studies that is to-day more neglected than that of the Targums. The majority of Biblical students know little more of the subject than that it was conventional in the Synagogue for an interpreter to follow the reading of the Hebrew Scriptures by an oral rendering of the Hebrew into the popular Aramaic dialect of the community, giving his translation verse by verse in the reading of the Law, and three verses at a time in the case of the Prophets. Jews and Christians alike appear to have neglected the Targums, yet it is capable of proof that it is in the Targums that the literary link between Judaism and Christianity consists. These, at all events, were a part of their common belief and worship, before the Church had detached itself from the Synagogue. Moreover the oldest Syriac Scriptures appear

to be in dependence (in part, at least) upon the Targums recited in the Synagogue, and the Gospels themselves in their earliest tradition and translation are affected by them. It would be easy to show that the New Testament is under the influence of Targum beyond what has yet been recognised by writers on the subject, and that it is highly probable that our Lord made his defence at his trial and uttered his despair upon the cross in language taken from the Targum. So we repeat that it is strange and regrettable that so little has been done for the elucidation of the Targums. We must not linger over the subject, or we should never reach our main field of enquiry, which concerns itself with the *Odes of Solomon*. If it should turn out that such enquiry should re-act upon Targum studies, we shall not be very much surprised.

Let us then come to the *Odes*, and to the point that has been reached in their criticism and explanation.

The recent publication of the John Rylands Library edition of the *Odes of Solomon* has revived a number of smouldering controversies, and made it clear that the last word is not yet said on the place of origin and the time of production of the *Odes*, and the language in which they are composed. No doubt much has been gained on the side of intelligibility: perplexing and even unique in their complexity as are these beautiful songs of the spirit, they have begun to yield up their obscurity, and, if mystical, to cease from being mysterious.

When we examine what the principal reviewers have had to say on the new edition, we find that almost every one of them has something to add to the resultant elucidation, even when their criticisms seem to be dictated by party-spirit or prepossessions. They will serve an auxiliary purpose, over and above their actual value as comments, in proving that

the editors of the recent volumes had not exhausted their theme, and that there is a good deal still to be discovered and disclosed. For that reason I should like to make one or two fresh statements with regard to what I now consider to be the real crux of the interpretation of the *Odes*.

I do not begin by a fresh discussion of the extent to which the *Odes* may be coloured by baptismal references (including references to baptismal ritual), which is the arena to which Dr. Bernard invites me, and where he thinks as challenger to hold the field, crying, " how much " where I whisper " how little." Dr. Bernard knows as well as anyone that the question of baptismal allusions cannot be dissociated from the question of the date of production of the songs. The two go together ; either involves the other. If the *Odes* were written at the end of the first century, there can be no highly evolved baptismal references ; if, on the other hand, they were produced, as Bernard believes, at the end of the second century, then it is not impossible, however unlikely, that the baptismal practices of the Church of Antioch of the fourth century might be carried back to the second century ; the question of date dominates the controversy, unless, of course, we assume that the date itself is deducible from the possible baptismal allusions. If, however, we can prove the earlier date by another path, then no one knows better than Dr. Bernard that *cadit quaestio*.

Something similar is the case of the controversy over the original language of the *Odes*, whether Greek (as Dom Connolly, and myself originally), or Hebrew (as Dr. Abbott), or Syriac (as myself *now* and my colleague Dr. Mingana). Around this question much irrelevant discourse has been going on, the irrelevancy being often due to the imperfect knowledge of the languages involved, and the consequent over-manipulation of dictionaries and grammars. Here also the problem suggests another path to the goal. It is curious

that the reviewers to whom we referred (Bernard and Connolly) have failed to see that such a new path to the solution of the involved problems was actually pointed out to them in the new edition. *The path in question is the proved dependence of the Odist upon the Biblical Targums.* To this point of view we now return in order to make our argument somewhat more transparent to those to whom it has been either obscure or negligible. To Dr. Bernard it was certainly negligible ; he brushed it aside in a sentence or so, although it was really the most important thing that had yet been said from the standpoint of the critic. He had this excuse, that the editors of the recent volume did not say as much as might have been said on the subject of Targumism in the *Odes*.

Dr. Bernard's statement was as follows :

" Harris calls attention to phrases which are like those which a Targumist would have used, and to one or two passages in which he thinks that the direct influence of the Targums may be traced. . . . It is probable, I think, that he provides the true explanation for most of the parallels . . . when he says 'such expressions (as the Targumist paraphrases) readily become conventional, at least among Aramaic-speaking peoples. They pass into the religious language of the time.'[1] But it is doubtful if we can say more than this."

To which we would reply that it is difficult to say less than this and is very nearly equivalent to saying nothing at all. And when we turn to Dr. Bernard's other review in the *Church Quarterly* for October, 1920, we find that the reviewer has actually chosen this line of defence for his position ; he never alludes to the Targums at all, though, as we have abundantly shown, they are the key to the whole problem. In the one review he treats the Targums as negligible, having

[1] *Theology*, Nov. 1920, p. 293.

actually ignored them in the other review. It will be seen presently that this was quite inadequate ; it was criticism by the omission of the matter to be criticised.

In the new edition of the *Odes* it is brought out quite clearly that the author was a scholar as well as a saint. Whether he was a Greek scholar is the point on which Dom Connolly has laboured, and concerning which he has disputed much with Dr. Abbott. We have shown, on our part, that he was a Hebrew scholar ; that he knew the variants in the Hebrew text ; how else could he have versified the two forms in which the 100th Psalm comes to us .

"It is *He that* hath *made us*
Not we ourselves,
or
And His we are."

That single case of the poetic use of both variants, in *Ode* VII.,

"He hath given Himself to be seen of *them that are His,*
That they might recognise *Him that made them,*
And might *not* suppose that they came of *themselves*"
(*Ode* VII. 12),

should have settled the question of the acquaintance of the writer with the Hebrew text.

It came out clearly that there were other cases of Hebraism (such as would be a distinct gain to Dr. Abbott's argument), but it was also evident that there were suggestions of a possible acquaintance with the text of the LXX (which sent the argument back again into the hands of Dom Connolly ("'twill away again from me to you"). The most convincing of such passages was Proverbs viii. 22, where the Hebrew says :

"The Lord possessed me (i.e. Wisdom),"

and the LXX says,

"The Lord created me,"

in which it has the support of the Targum, and where the

Odist says both (see *Ode* XII. 9, "He who *possessed* me from the beginning," i.e., the Father of Truth; and *Ode* VII. 8, "He who *created* Wisdom is wiser than His works").

By these and similar passages we prove that the Odist was acquainted with the Hebrew of the Old Testament, and perhaps also with the LXX.

In the same way we proved his dependence upon the Syriac Bible, and argued from it that the *Odes* were composed in Syriac. It is not necessary to repeat the argument here, for, as we have said, the whole question will be affected by the discovery that the Odist was also acquainted with the Biblical Targum. That acquaintance is the key to the interpretation of the *Odes*.

We can approach the subject best by expanding what is said in the new edition on the dependence of the first *Ode of Solomon* upon the first Psalm in the Psalter.

Speaking generally, we find that the dependence of the *Odes* upon the Targums is, in the first instance, linguistic: the *Odes* speak a Targumic dialect; we discovered, however, something much more important than an agreement in dialect. It turned out, upon examination, that the *Odes* actually versify for us portions of the Psalter; this came clearly to light on comparing the first *Ode* and the first Psalm. When we put them side by side, the fact of borrowing was undeniable. There was a crown of unwithering and blossoming and fruit-bearing branches in the *Ode*, which was clearly the duplicate of the tree whose branches hang over the first Psalm, whose leaf never withers and which brings forth its fruit in its season. It may be asked how that coincidence in theme proves the Targum on the Psalms to be the link between the Psalter and the *Odes*. Let us see. The question arose in one's mind whether the Odist had anything to answer to the statement that

"Whatsoever he doeth shall prosper."

At this point I made the conjecture that perhaps the prosperous doer was not the hero of the Psalm, but the tree that represented him pictorially. Students of the first chapter of Genesis in the Hebrew, whose exercitations on the text have not wholly slipped away from them (*tempus edax rerum semiticarum*) will recall the expression

"tree of fruit making (*or* doing) fruit,"

and students of the New Testament will at once recognise the "tree that makes (*or* does) good fruit"; so that there was a possibility that the tree in the Psalter could be regarded as prosperous, in which case we had an explanation of the closing words of the *Ode*,

"My fruits are full and perfect:
They are full of thy salvation."

A reference to the Targum on the Psalm showed that this was also the view taken by the Targumist, who explains that

"Every germ that germinates ripens and prospers."

I notice that this coincidence with the interpretation of the Targum is a coincidence with what is regarded by modern critics as a fantastic piece of exegesis. For instance, Baethgen says in his commentary that it is "distorted and unnatural." Very good! Then in that case the agreement between the Odist and the Targum is the more noteworthy. Clearly our next step is to print the Targum and the *Ode* side by side, and examine for further coincidences of thought and expression.

Here they are in juxtaposition.

Psalm (*Targum*).	*Ode* I.
Blessed, etc.	The Lord is upon my head like a crown;
But his delight is in the Law (νόμος) of the Lord, and in his law doth he meditate day and night;	And I shall not be without it.
And he shall be like a tree of life (*or* living tree) that is	The crown of truth was woven for me;
	And it caused thy branches to germinate in me.

planted by the streams of water, whose fruit ripens in its season, and its leaves do not fall; and every germ that it germinates swells like a berry and prospers.

For it is not like a withered crown which does not germinate,
But thou livest upon my head,
And thou hast germinated upon my head;
Thy fruits are full and perfect,
Full of thy salvation.

The coincidences are open and palpable; when, moreover, we turn to the fourth *Ode*, we find the Odist's adaptation of "brings forth fruit in its season" in the form

"never wilt thou fail nor be without fruit";

and when we turn to the 41st *Ode*, we find the exhortation

"In his *Love* let us meditate night and day."

Almost every word and thought in the Psalm is now seen to be reproduced or imitated in the *Odes*, generally from the medium of the Targum. There only remains the opening stanza of *Ode* 1: can we find that? Where does the crown come from that is on the singer's head?

It is curious that, as far as I know, no one has detected the source of the passage with which the Ode opens. Suppose we turn to the Targum on Isaiah xxviii. 5, and we shall find as follows:

"In that time the Messiah of the Lord of Hosts shall be for a crown of joy and for a diadem of praise for the remnant of the people; for the word of truth, etc." Here the word for "crown" is the same as in the *Odes*; the word for diadem is a somewhat rare word (*kathar*), which the Peshitta version renders by *gedila*, "a woven wreath"; this at once supplies us with the line, "the crown of truth was woven for me" (the "truth," also, comes from the Targum). Thus there is no doubt that the opening verses of the *Ode* are also Targumic in origin. For the final allusion to the Lord on the head of the singer, of which crown he is not to be deprived, the explanation appears to be, that the Targumists

believed that the ancient Israel who came out of Egypt were, every one, crowned with the Incommunicable Name; they lost it when they worshipped the golden calf!

Hence in the Targum of Jonathan on Exodus xxii. 25 we are told that the children of Israel had been deprived by the hands of Aaron of the holy crown which was on their heads, for the great and glorious Name was graven and interpreted (*mephorash*) upon it.

This helps us not only to understand the first verse of *Ode* 1, but also to explain *Ode* 8 (21),

"They shall not be detached from my Name, for it is with them."

The new Israel claims to be more faithful than the Ancient Israel, and to have recovered their lost privileges.

That will be sufficient to show that the first *Ode* is in dependence upon the Biblical Targum.

Now let us see whether the key which we have in our hands will open any more locks in the perplexities of the *Odes*.

In *Ode* XVII. (6) Christ is made to say,

"He who knew and *brought me up*
Is the Most High in all His perfection."

There seems to be no doubt that the Odist is speaking in the person of Christ at this point, and, from thence, right on to the end of the *Ode*, with the exception of the closing doxology to the Messiah. What does the Odist mean by God *rearing* the Messiah?

The answer is that this is the language of the Targum. In Isaiah lxi. 1 the Targum opens with

"The Spirit of prophecy from before Jahveh is upon me, because *the Lord hath brought me up*"; the expression is the same as in the *Ode*. The language of the *Ode* is the language of the Targum.

Now that we know the text upon which the Odist is working, the whole of the *Ode* will become luminous. For

Isaiah lxi. goes on to say that the Messiah is to proclaim "deliverance to the captives and the opening to them that are bound." So the Odist tells us that the Messiah, in whose name he speaks, has opened the doors that are closed and has liberated the bondmen.

> "I opened the doors that were closed.
> . . . . . .
> Nothing appeared closed to me
> Because I was the opening of everything.
> I went towards all the bondmen to loose them."

There can be no doubt as to the fact of the versification of Isaiah by the Odist.

We notice further that in the Hebrew the word "opening" is unexpanded. Our Bibles explain it as the "opening *of the prison*"; the Greek suggests that it is the "opening of the eyes." The Odist resolves the ambiguity by saying, "I was the opening *of everything*."

Some further points of interest are at once suggested. This passage of Isaiah is said by Luke to have been read by our Lord at the opening of His ministry in the synagogue at Nazareth. It will be remembered that the recitation is introduced by the remark that

> "He came to Nazareth *where he had been reared*."

The language is remarkable in view of the Targum, for it must be allowed that what our Lord read in the synagogue to a Galilean congregation must have been accompanied by the Aramaic Targum, without which it would have been unintelligible to a Northern gathering. So the question is raised whether Luke may not actually have been working on an Aramaic text, and that he had before him not the Hebrew text, nor the Septuagint, but the Targum. Moreover, the supposition that the Targum had been read with its reference to the prophetic spirit from Jahveh would explain why our Lord speaks of Himself, in reply to the questioning that followed, as a prophet: "I say to you, No prophet, etc."

May it not be possible that when we replace the synagogue lesson by its Targum, or at all events place them side by side, that we may not only explain our Lord's assumption of the prophetic office, and His comparison of Himself with the ancient prophets (Elijah and Elisha), but that we may see the meaning of the enquiry "Is not this Joseph's son?" as dependent upon the statement, "Jahveh reared me"? It will be remembered that in John vi. 42 we have something similar, where Jesus says that He came down from Heaven like the manna, and the people ask if He is not Joseph's son, and how can He say that He descended from Heaven. In the same way we might, in Luke, complete the popular question, "Is not this Joseph's son?" by the further remark, "How then doth He say, God reared me?"

We may, then, be doing more than to elucidate and make transparent the language of a single *Ode*; we may be illuminating, by means of the *Ode*, the New Testament itself. We are not yet at the end of the closed doors which our key will open.

There is another passage in Isaiah where the Targum has made a similar substitution, and represented the Most High as *rearing the Messiah*, and this passage also was known to the Odist and was utilised by him.

In Isaiah xlii. 6 we have language very similar to that in Isaiah xli. The Servant (the Messiah) is addressed in the following terms:

"I, the Lord, have called thee in righteousness . . . to open the blind eyes, to bring out the prisoners from the dungeons, and them that sit in darkness out of the prison-house." Here the Targum begins:

"I, Jahveh, have *brought thee up* in truth."

Here we have the same expressions as before for *the rearing* of the Messiah.

But now look a little closer at the *Ode* in question:

"He who knew and *reared me*
Is the Most High in all His perfection,
And He glorified me by His kindness,
And heightened my thought to the height of *the Truth*."

Here we see the use which the Odist makes of the language of the prophet as to being "brought up in the Truth." He is evidently familiar with the Targum in this passage also.

We will ask one question more: did he know that "brought me up" had been substituted for "anointed me" in Isaiah lxi.? Does he betray any knowledge of the other reading?

In *Ode* XXXVI. 6 we have Christ speaking as follows: "He *anointed me* from His own perfection," a similar expression to the one which we have been studying; and we are entitled to infer that the Odist was closely acquainted with the Hebrew of Isaiah as well as with the Targum. That will suffice for the present to show that Targumism must be conceded, if the *Odes* are to be understood.

If we now turn to *Ode* XXXV. we shall strike some notable matter. We have in v. 4 the statement of the Odist that the Lord was "more to him than *shelter*, and more to him than foundations," and we showed that by a word play upon "dew" (Syr. ṭalla) and upon "shelter" (Syr. ṭillola), the Odist went on to the similar word for "child" or "boy" (Syr. ṭalya), so that in the next verse he could say:

"And I was carried like a child (Syr. ṭalya) by its mother;
And he gave me milk, the dew (Syr. ṭalla) of the Lord;
And I was reared (Syr. ethrabbith) by his bounty."

We notice again the Targumic language for the Messiah.

Now let us see if we can find the original from which the Odist takes his picture of the God-carried and the God-suckled child.

If we turn to Numbers xi. 12, we find as follows: Moses,

upon whom the burden of the people is pressing with increasing weight, protests to the Lord thus :

"Have I conceived all this people, have I brought them forth ? that thou shouldest say unto me, carry them in thy bosom, *as a nursing-father carrieth the sucking-child* unto the land which thou swarest unto their fathers ? "

We see why the Odist passes from "I was carried" to "He gave me milk," for it is a sucking-child that is being carried (the later targum [of Jerusalem] turns the foster-father into a παιδαγωγός). Let us now examine the word which we translate "nursing-father" ; the Targum says, *tarbyana*, a form which is derived from the root for *growth* (rabby) ; the Peshiṭta follows this closely with *mrabyana*, from the same stem ; now we see why the Odist goes on with

"And I became great (*or* was reared) by His bounty,"

the word used being *ethrabbith* from the same root as appears in the tradition of the Targum and the Peshiṭta. No such connexion can be traced in the Hebrew of the passage. The structure of the *Ode* is only visible in the Syriac, and we may be sure that the Odist is using either the Syriac Bible or its related Targum.

This is a peculiarly interesting case on another account : it will have been noticed that the Odist is very shy of the Pentateuch ; he never uses the word "Law" in the whole of his song-book, where it would come in naturally as in Psalm i.,

"In his law shall he meditate day and night,"

he boldly writes *Love* for *Law* (*Ode* XII. 6, "Let us meditate in His love, night and day"), and thereby expresses the whole difference between Judaism and Christianity. In the passage referred to in Numbers he has no difficulty ; here Law and Love are speaking the same language ; so he quotes, and makes delightful word-play out of what he reads.

The influence of Psalm xxi. upon the *Odes* has been already pointed out in the new edition, where the margin of the ninth *Ode* shows parallels as follows :

Psalm xx. (xxi.) 4.	"An everlasting crown is Truth. Blessed are they who set it on their heads.
Psalm xx. (xxi.) 4, LXX	"A stone of great price it is."

Here it was shown that the language was based upon the verses,

"Thou preventest Him with the blessings of goodness.
Thou settest a crown of pure gold (LXX 'of precious stone') on His head."

In the expository notes it was pointed out that the reference to the Psalms went further, for the language of the *Ode* was :

"In the will of the Lord is your life,
And His intention is Life everlasting" ;

which is directly based upon :

"He asked life of thee,
And thou gavest it him—even life for ever and ever" (Ps. xx. [xxi.] 5).

It was further pointed out that the Odist regards the Psalm as Messianic, with Christ for King ; it can thus be described as "the holy thought which God has thought concerning His Messiah."

When this sentence was written it had not been noticed that *the Targum on the Psalm takes this very view* ; for the Targum opens as follows :

"O Lord, in thy strength the *King Messiah* shall rejoice
and in thy salvation how greatly shall he exult."

The same explanation is in verse 9 of the Targum which says that

"The *King Messiah* trusts in the Lord and by the mercy of the Most High he shall not be moved."

And it is from the Targum that the Odist obtained his description of the "holy thought which the Lord hath

thought *concerning His Messiah*." When, therefore, we speak of the ninth *Ode* as a pendant to Psalm xxi. the chains on which it depends are the Targum and the Septuagint.

The same Psalm has also been used in the fifth *Ode* in verses 8, 10, 12, apparently without any Messianic reflection.

The discovery that the Odist is often engaged in expanding and commenting upon particular psalms and prophecies furnishes us with the clue to the elucidation of many obscurities in the text, and frequently makes the whole of the *Ode* into a unity, when at first sight it appeared to be a group of ill-connected fragments. One of the best instances is the passage from Isaiah lxi. which we have already been discussing. The mentality of the writer is clearly being revealed; his scholarship also becomes evident. We are certain that he used the Targum and the related Peshitta version, and he may also on occasions have used the LXX. So we now know enough of the methods of composition to apply it to particular *Odes*.

Suppose, for example, that we are studying the third *Ode*. We ask the question whether it has any Old Testament antecedents, and the answer comes back that the key to the *Ode* on this side (without denying the possibility of a connexion with St. John, who tells us that we love because we are first loved) lies in a verse of the eighth chapter of Proverbs, with which chapter we know the writer elsewhere to be familiar.

The verse is as follows:

> "I love them that love me;
> Those that seek me shall find me."
> (Prov. viii. 17.)

This explains at once the language about the "lover who has found the beloved," and makes parallels with the Odist's expansions:

"He loves me,"
"I love the Beloved,"

and when we examine further for linguistic parallels, the result is interesting. The writer is working on the Peshiṭta version, which says:

"I love my lovers (*or* my lover),"

and using the same root (*rḥm*) as in the *Ode* in both cases where "love" is mentioned. It is *not* the Greek text which has two words (*ἀγαπῶ* and *φιλ*) both expressing the same Hebrew root (let the commentators on John xxi. note this), which is a different root from either the Peshiṭta or its Targum.

Then the third *Ode* must be added to the Wisdom *Odes*, and Christ appears in it as the Divine Wisdom, as elsewhere.

This at once restores the sequence with the last two verses of the *Odes*, which are also Wisdom verses: we can see this by comparing these verses with the speech of Wisdom, the prophetic Virgin in *Ode* XXXIII. 6–8, which is also evidently based on Proverbs viii., e.g., *Ode* XXXIII.:

"O ye *sons of men, return ye.*
I will *make you wise in the ways of truth.*"

Ode III.:

"This is the Spirit of the Lord which *doth not lie,*
which teacheth the *sons of men* to know *His ways. Be wise.*"

Proverbs viii.:

"My voice is *to the sons of men.*
Blessed are they that *keep My ways;*
Hear instruction and *be wise.*"

From these parallels it is clear that the close of the third *Ode* is also a pendant to the eighth of Proverbs, and in that ense the *Ode* acquires a literary unity.

I have made it clear, then, that the language of the Odist and his thought are alike dependent upon the Targum and the related Peshiṭta version. It is not a sufficient explana-

tion to say that the coincidences between the language of the Odist and the Aramaic and Syriac texts is an accident of translation. The coincidences are in the thought as well as in the language. A translator would not know what the Odist was working upon, for his Scripture allusions are carefully disguised. It has taken very close analysis to recover them; but the argument for their existence in Syro-Aramaic form appears to be incontrovertible.

We will take another illustration, for it is only by repeated instances that some of our critics can be reached.

The close of the fifth *Ode* is a noble passage, comparable in some respects with the last verses of the eighth chapter of Romans. When we examine it closely it is seen to be a cento of passages from the Psalms, with variations such as the Odist habitually uses. For example, we might write parallels from the Psalter against the following verses:

> "For my hope is upon the Lord,
> And I will not fear;
> And because the Lord is my salvation
> I will not fear."
>
> (*Ode* V. 10, 11.)

Here the language suggests to us Psalm xxvii. 1,

> "The Lord is my light and my salvation, whom shall I fear? The Lord is the strength of my life, of whom shall I be afraid?"

The next verse is parallel to certain phrases in Psalm xxi., e.g.:

> "And He is a crown upon my head, and I shall not be moved,"

may be compared with

> "Thou settest a crown of pure gold on his head." (Ps. xxi. 4.)
>
> "The King trusteth in the Lord, and by the mercy of the Most High he shall not be moved." (Ps. xxi. 8.)

But this thought, "he shall not be moved," takes the Odist naturally into Psalm xlvi., out of which he evolves his closing stanzas. We will examine the language of these verses more closely; here are the parallels:

"I shall not be moved.
Even if everything should be moved
I stand firm.
If things visible should perish
I shall not die:
Because the Lord is with me
And I am with Him."
(*Ode* V.)

"God is our refuge and strength
Though the earth be removed
And the mountains be carried into the heart of the sea.
God is in the midst of her
She shall not be moved.
The heathen raged, the kingdoms were moved. . . .
The Lord of Hosts is with us.
The God of Jacob is our refuge."
(Ps. xlvi.)

Here it is easy to see the string in the Psalmist's lyre that sets up the vibration in the instrument of the Odist. Let us then see where the language of the latter reflects that of the former. We shall find upon comparison that the Hebrew is working with quite different roots from the Odist, but that the Peshiṭta Syriac gives a constant refrain, which the Odist has imitated. The earth moves, the mountain moves, the kingdoms move, etc.: We see why the Odist says, "If everything should be moved, etc."

So we conclude that the Odist has been working on a Syriac text, and not on Hebrew or Greek; this time the coincidence is with the Peshiṭta, rather than with the Targum, but it is known that the two are closely related.

We have shown in our edition how constantly the Odist uses Targumic language, so as to avoid saying things about God which involve an anthropomorphic conception, or which imply a localisation of the Divine Presence. We know how important these changes were which the meturgeman made in his reading, for they sometimes have affected the Hebrew text also, i.e. the vowels of the text, but not the consonants. For instance, in Isaiah i. 12 the Lord asks His people as follows:

"When ye come *to see My face*
Who required this of you?"

This is corrected in the Hebrew pointing by turning the

verb into a passive (syncopated Niphal), so that we read it,

"When ye come to be seen before my face,"

for certainly no one can see the face of God.

And if the Hebrew text has avoided the doubtful language, much more will the Targum do so, for it says :

"When ye come *to be seen before Me.*"

Now this awkward circumlocution turns up in the ninth *Ode*, and the recognition of its existence makes a very obscure passage lucid ; in our translation it runs thus :

"The seers shall go before Him,
And they shall be seen before Him."

Evidently the Odist did not want to say, "they shall come to see my face," so he makes the would-be seers into those that are seen. We get something of the same kind in Psalm xlii., where even the English Bible uses a paraphrase and asks,

"When shall I come and appear before God ?"

Is the Odist actually using the first chapter of Isaiah ? Let us see.

The text of the prophet goes on to denounce the sacrifice of the people as unholy and invalid : the Lord asks,

"When ye come to see my face . . . who hath required this ?
Bring no more vain oblations."

It was a passage that was in constant use in the early anti-Judaic movement. The Odist evidently approves the negation of sacrifice, but his teaching is not merely negative ; he tells us that

"The seers shall appear before Him,
And they shall *offer* (*neqarrbon*) their songs,"

meaning the "sacrifice of praise." The Odist is seen to be something more than a Targumist manipulating a text. He is asking the question, "If oblations are vain, what shall

we offer ? " and his solution is that " Whoso offereth praise glorifieth me." (Psalm L. 22, and cf. verses 13, 14, " Will I eat the flesh of bulls, and drink the blood of goats ? *Offer unto God the sacrifice of thanksgiving.*") So he brings his songs.

We have now to add these instances of Targumism to those which have been already accumulated in the new edition ; they appear to be of the nature of incontestable evidence. How is this Targumism to be explained ? Clearly it is insufficient to say with Dr. Bernard that it is the natural religious language of the time and district where the *Odes* were produced ; for the coincidences observed deal with particular passages of Scripture, and must have come either from an oral or a written Targum, i.e., from a man or a book. It is the fashion to say that there were no written Targums before the fourth or fifth century. If that presupposition could be maintained we should have to admit that the Odist himself was a meturgeman, with his mind and memory stored with Targum ; he would, in that case, have walked out of the synagogue and into the church bringing his Targum with him ; and, in that case also he must have been a convert of the first period. It is not, however, necessary to endorse too positively such a statement as that of the late transfer of the Targums to writing. The grounds for such a supposition are probably insufficient. It may be a mere attempt to exalt the Hebrew text, which people did not understand, at the expense of the Aramaic, which they did understand. If our *Odes* suggest anything it is the use of a written Targum. We feel sure that when Luke composed his account of the scene at Nazareth, with its Targumistic touches in the narration, he had before him the written text that underlay the Lord's discourse. Surely that means that the written Targum of Isaiah was earlier than the Gospel of Luke. This written Targum is what the Odist has been using. It does not preclude the possibility

that he was a meturgeman as well as an Odist ; he must, at least, have been a Targum student ; nor can we expect to find such except in the first age of the Church. For the Targumists are a synagogue guild. There is no contact between the church and the synagogue, at the end of the second century, which would suggest a trained Jewish convert as the Christian choirmaster. Dr. Bernard's date for his assumed baptismal rituals was pushed back by him to the furthest possible limits of ecclesiastical imagination. Even so it is probably a hundred years too late ; and the theory based on the date, or accompanying it, must be abandoned. The discovery of the Targum that underlies the *Odes* has torpedoed it.

We have reserved the possibility that the Odist was himself a Synagogue Interpreter or Meturgeman. Here is a remarkable confirmation of this belief. In *Ode* XXVI., after a noble song in the manner of Psalm cvii., the writer breaks out as follows :

> " Oh ! that one could *interpret* the wonders of the Lord !
> For though the *Meturgeman* should be dissolved
> His *Targum* would remain."

This passage, with its threefold play on the word *interpret*, becomes very luminous when we observe that in the nature of the case it is the Odist who is himself the meturgeman of the desired song, and his Targum of which he speaks is the song which he is longing to compose. " Oh ! that one could interpret " means " Oh ! that I could."

The prophecy in which he indulged has come true ; he himself has disappeared, and not even his name remains ; but his work has been recovered and will be the joy of Christian hearts for many days to come.

He expressed himself somewhat like Keats when he said,

" I think that I shall be among the English poets after my death."

Rendel Harris.

THE MINISTRY OF WOMEN AND ST. PAUL.

In an earlier essay, published in *Theology*, I endeavoured to prove that women's partnership in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church received no effective recognition from our Lord, and that neither the Apostolic Commission nor the Evangelistic Charge was in any way addressed to them. I now go on to examine the position held in regard to this question by that eminent follower of our Lord, the great Apostle of the Gentiles.

It is a matter of the greatest interest and importance in the present day to determine whether, in 1 Corinthians xiv. 34, St. Paul's prohibition to women to speak in the Churches or Assemblies of the Christians was meant to be of universal or merely local application. The Bishops at the Lambeth Conference appear to have taken the latter view, and to confine the Apostle's words chiefly or entirely to the Church at Corinth to which he was writing. "In the assembly," they say, "St. Paul contemplated the whole Christian society in Corinth being gathered together (*v.* 23); and, what is far more important for our purpose, he expected that persons ignorant of the faith and even that unbelievers—heathen men—would find their way in. Those who were converts from the worship of idols and those who still worshipped idols alike knew only too well the shameful position which women took in the heathen temples and their rites. Corinth was a very by-word for vice. The Greeks coined a word 'to corinthianize,' meaning thereby 'to play the harlot.' The female temple slaves were simply prostitutes. At Corinth then, in the Christian assemblies, with their doors thrown open to all comers, St. Paul sternly said that it was 'shameful for a woman to speak.' Here women must set an example such as no one could question

(to use the words of the Pastoral Epistle) of 'shamefastness and sobriety.'" Accordingly, the intention of the words is seemingly narrowed to the Church at Corinth, or at least to it and others of like surroundings.

Is there any reason to doubt this conclusion? There is. St. Paul does not even allude in the place to the prevalence of vice at Corinth. In a little Tractate, by Dr. Sparrow Simpson, entitled *St. Paul on the Ministry of Women* (S.P.C.K.), with which in the main I heartily agree, no account is taken of this restriction of the words by way of explanation. In the *International Critical Commentary* on 1 Corinthians, by Robertson and Plummer, I do not see a word about the application of the passage merely to the Corinthian Church. "Had the Apostle heard," ask these Commentators, "of Gaia Afrania, wife of Licinius Buccio, a contentious lady who insisted on pleading her own causes in court, and was such a nuisance to the prætors that an edict was made prohibiting women from pleading? She died B.C. 48." The Greek sentiment on the subject is, they observe, to be seen in Thuc. II. 45. 3, 4 (according to Jowett's translation): "And if I am to speak of womanly virtues to those of you who will henceforth be widows, let me sum them up in one short admonition: To a woman not to show more weakness than is natural to her sex is a great glory, and not to be talked about for good or for evil among men."

And if the words were intended mainly or solely for the Church at Corinth, why does the Apostle say much the same to Timothy (1 Tim. ii. 8–12): "It is my will then that men pray in every place. . . . As for a woman, let her learn in quietness with all submission. But I permit not a woman to teach, nor to lord it over a man, but to be in quietness"? Timothy was most likely in Ephesus when he received the missive, and seems to have been St. Paul's prospective

successor in the general care of the Churches. So that the admonition, as addressed to him, would either carry a general import, or at least would be good for a far wider area than was contained within the walls of Corinth.

I propose, however, to examine St. Paul's words to the Corinthians exegetically, in order to see whether even in themselves they do not lead to a solution of this vexed question. But before doing so one or two other passages call for investigation, as they have been set up in opposition to the Apostle's later statement. In Galatians iii. 28 we read : " There is not here (in Christ) Jew nor Greek ; there is not bond nor free ; there is not male and female ; for all of you are one (man) in Christ Jesus." That is, in the mystical body of Christ, of which He is head, race, condition, sex, make no difference ; all are spiritually and alike united to Him. But, as the Bishops justly observe, " the oneness of the body allows, indeed implies, diversity of function. The passage does not touch the question of the character of the woman's functions in the Church. It does not in the least suggest that the functions of women are the same as the functions of men. It simply asserts that membership in the one body is not restricted by race or by social status or by sex."

Far more to the purpose is the passage in the same Epistle to the Corinthians (1 Cor. xi. 4, 5) : " Every man that prays or prophesies, having his head covered, dishonours his head ; but every woman that prays or prophesies with her head unveiled dishonours her head." Here man and woman are spoken of as functioning or at liberty to function in the same way. The only reservation offered is that woman shall not ape man or try to be mannish when she does so by having no covering on (or over) her head. Nothing is said about the place where it all happens. Many take this to be the Church or Assembly, because a veil would be

unnecessary at home. But the fact is that the Apostle is really concerned at the moment with the veiling of the woman's head. She is to do nothing of a public character with her head unveiled. The statement about her praying or prophesying is not obtruded; and the latter, at least, is inhibited later in all public assemblies of the Church. But that women did prophesy in the early times there can be no doubt. Prophecy was speaking as persons were moved by the Holy Ghost, or as the Spirit gave them utterance. And under the Old Dispensation the gift was possessed by women like Miriam, Deborah, Hannah, Huldah. The aged Anna (Luke ii. 36) was a prophetess, and Mary the Virgin spoke under Divine inspiration when she sang her Magnificat. As regards the New Dispensation it is foretold, with application to the Day of Pentecost, that "your daughters," not less than "your sons," "shall prophesy," and "upon My servants, both male and female, in those days will I pour out of My Spirit, and they shall prophesy." Moreover (Acts xxi. 9), Philip the Evangelist "had four daughters, virgins, who prophesied." Hence the gift of prophecy was not exclusive; only the use of it was denied to women in the Assemblies. But everywhere else, apparently, they could exercise their gift. We know, as regards the associated act of praying, that women were engaged in prayer in the Upper Room (Acts i. 14), and in the house of Mary, Mark's mother (Acts xii. 5, 12), and came together to pray by the riverside in Philippi (Acts xvi. 13). And the genuine widow (1 Tim. v. 5) applies herself to supplications and prayers night and day. Passages like these are suggestive of Prayer Meetings, where women might not only pray aloud, but exercise their gift of inspired utterance. Bible-women and district visitors among ourselves pray with and speak words of counsel and admonition to those they visit, whether in town slums or in country

villages. And if we remember that at that time a Christian Church was only a small community amid a mass of heathen, we have only to call up the image of our own Mission-women, and the action they have to take in their dealings with the heathen of far-off lands. They are doctors, teachers, preachers. Only is it reserved to the missionary clergy to lead the prayers and preach the Word of God in the congregations that meet in the Churches as these gradually arise. Accordingly, the words we have been considering do not contain any inherent difficulty when compared with the strict inhibition that follows later on in the Epistle.

And so we come to ch. xiv. 34, 35, and we naturally scrutinise the passage closely to see if it offers any reasons in favour of a narrower or wider application of its terms. The passage runs thus: "Let the women keep silence in the Churches (Assemblies); for it is not permitted them to speak; no, but let them be in subjection, even as also the law saith. But if they wish to learn anything, let them enquire of their own husbands at home; for it is shameful for a woman to speak in the Church (Assembly)." The mixed congregations of men and women meeting together for public worship are intended.

"Let the women keep silence in the Churches; for it is not permitted (or permissible) to them to speak." Another reading is "your women"; but, while the authorities for both readings are excellent, those for the first reading are somewhat the better, and so it has been more generally accepted. In any case, the words are primarily addressed to the Corinthian community ("When ye come together," ver. 26), but are of universal adaptation, and might equally well be addressed to any other Christian Church, being grounded, not on the vicious surroundings of Corinth, but on quite other reasons, as we shall see. "Speaking" (*λαλεῖν*) here is simply the opposite to "being silent"

(σιγᾶν), and apparently includes asking questions, as well as preaching or teaching, but *not*, as the context shows, mere talking or ordinary conversation. So Jesus in the Temple sat in the midst of the doctors, both hearing them and asking them questions, as well as giving answers of His own.

"No, but let them be in subjection, *even as also the Law directs.*" The Law, as well as myself. The use of the conjunction ἀλλά (cf. Acts xix. 2, 2 Cor. viii. 5, Gal. ii. 3, Phil. ii. 17) points to a further advance on what has been said before. Subjection or subordination includes silence, and explains it. That the women are to be silent in public is only part of a wider principle, that they are to be subject, which depends on an ordinance of God's Law, found in Genesis iii. 16: "Thy desire shall be to thy husband, and he shall rule over thee." Very similarly, we read in Ephesians v. 22, 23: "Let the women be in subjection to their husbands, as to the Lord; for the man is the head of the woman (cf. 1 Cor. xi. 3)." There, on like grounds a command primarily addressed to the Ephesian (or other) community is evidently intended to be of universal application, because based on a universal principle. So here, the fact that it is prescribed by the Law of God, ordaining woman's subordination, and, moreover, that that particular maxim of the Law dates (according to Jewish belief in those days) from the beginning of things, the origin of mankind, and so is valid for all humanity, shows that the subjection, including the silence, here imposed in the first place on the Corinthian Church, is capable of world-wide expansion. For the Law does not rule that the Corinthian women shall be in subjection, but that all women shall be so. *Their* special case is but a part of the whole. The Apostle is evidently laying down a general line of behaviour.

Take another instance of an appeal to the Law which

occurs in the same Epistle (ix. 7, 8): "Who goeth a warfare at any time at his own charges? . . . Say I these things as a man (from man's point of view), or saith not the Law the same? For in the Law of Moses it is written, Thou shalt not muzzle the ox when he treadeth out the corn." Here is an explicit reference to Deuteronomy xxv. 4. And the Law is declared to enjoin under a figure the support of the working ministry by the laity. "If we sowed to you spiritual things, is it a great thing if we shall reap your carnal things?" "The Lord ordained" (evidently under this figure) "that those who preach the Gospel should live off the Gospel." Here, though the words are spoken to the Corinthians, everything goes to prove that they are of universal application. The questions with which the subject is started are quite general. His own avowed practice in contravention of such due claims is clearly not confined to Corinth: "Woe is to me (*vv.* 16–18) if I preach not the Gospel. For if I do this willingly I have a reward, but if against my will I am entrusted with a stewardship. What, then, is my reward? That when preaching the Gospel I may make the Gospel free of cost." After which (ver. 19) his service to all, Jew and Gentile, is detailed. But apart from this, his appeal to the Law, as recording God's, not man's, verdict in the matter, and the unrestricted terms in which the Law's sentence is conveyed, indicate indisputably that we have here a matter of general obligation.

"To the Law and to the Testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." In the one case the word is: "Let the people support their pastor; for the labourer is worthy of his hire." In the other it is: "Let the women be in subjection," with the consequences, such as silence in public places, thence arising. And to whomsoever addressed, these rules are neither local nor temporary in their scope.

Silence estops even the asking of questions. These form part of the speaking in public assemblies, as in our Parliaments. But women are to keep themselves quiet in all ways, and if they wish to learn anything which is not clear to them, to consult their own husbands at home. This is part of their due subjection.

And then the Apostle sets the coping-stone to what has been said. "For," he adds, "it is disgraceful for a woman to speak in an (the) Assembly." That is, for any woman, Corinthian or otherwise. There is nothing confined or limited in the statement. It gives in brief St. Paul's complete sentiment on the matter, and gives it independently of times or circumstances or localities. Such being the case, there is no question of a woman speaking in public. *Causa finita est.* Even apart from the Law's sentence, silence is the duty of a woman, if by breaking it she shames herself. It is not the women of Corinth, the city of vice, but women in general, who are here enjoined. Silence in the Church, then, is, according to St. Paul, incumbent on the sex.

I will here introduce a pronouncement by another Jew, contemporary with St. Paul, and a great student and exponent of the Law. "Market-places," writes Philo (*De Spec. Leg.* iii. 31), "and council-chambers and courts of justice and festal companies *or* processions and crowded assemblies, and life in the open air passed in words and actions relating to war and peace, are suited to men, but staying at home and indoor life to womankind. . . . For there are two kinds of states, the larger and the smaller; the larger are called towns, the smaller houses. And men and women have divided between them the superintendence of the two, men taking that of the larger, which is called polity, women that of the smaller, which is called economy (housekeeping). So then let a woman busy herself about nothing outside the province of economy, making solitude

her aim, nor let her show herself like a street-walker to the public gaze, save only when it is necessary to go to the Temple, taking care even then not to do it when the market-place is full, but after the greater part of the people have gone home; like a freeborn woman and a genuine citizen, performing her offerings and vows (discharging her religious service) in quietude, for the averting of evils and procuring of blessings." St Paul, himself a Jew, would undoubtedly have acquiesced in these sentiments, which are in close accord with his own written words.

An argument of lesser weight in connexion with the question under consideration, but by no means to be overlooked, is the character of the city of Corinth itself. The Bishops regard it under one aspect, the moral, we may just glance at it from another point of view. Corinth was in those days a great mercantile port, to which men of all races flocked, and, as we know, it held a considerable colony of Jews. The Christian Church there would presumably consist of other Gentiles beside the native Corinthians, not to mention members of the Jewish brotherhood. It is hardly likely, therefore, that St. Paul wrote his letter to Corinthians, and Gentile Corinthians, only. With a changing and mobile population, his words would assuredly be carried far and wide, and have a much more extensive influence than was provided by the city itself. And we may readily surmise that wherever they went they would produce similar effects, and practically close the mouths of the women when they met in the public assemblies of their Churches. This would happen at the time, and would naturally eventuate more and more as the recognition of St. Paul's Epistles spread everywhere, and such a sentiment as the above was known in extending circles to have proceeded from the pen of the Apostle of the Gentiles. It may be, and probably was the case, that the general custom

of women's silence which ruled for ages in the Catholic Church was greatly due to the Pauline precept, which, whatever men or women may opine in modern days, was generally acknowledged to be of no mere local and temporary, but of universally binding import.

To bring the argument to a close, as we recall what has been advanced, and at the same time compare 1 Corinthians xii. 12, 27 with Galatians iii. 28, we may unhesitatingly conclude that St. Paul's verdict, like Philo's, was: "Oneness of Body, but diversity of function. Let neither sex invade or usurp the other's proper sphere." And whatever may come to be under modern conditions the position of women in the Councils and Ministrations of the Church, and however fitly and legitimately that position may be conceded to them, let us never attempt to base it upon Pauline precedents, nor, in order to advance its novel claims, lay ourselves out artificially to limit the range and application of Pauline regulations.

WILLIAM SPICER WOOD.

BALDWIN BROWN.[1]

ALL through his life, as the *Times* said, Baldwin Brown was a most staunch defender of freedom of thought. He always described himself, when he had to describe himself, simply as an Independent minister. His church he also called, and loved to call, an Independent Church. It was the old Independency and not the new Congregationalism to which he was attached. He had a keen suspicion and a great dread of complete ecclesiastical organisation. He felt as if truth lost one half its power the moment it was entrusted to an organisation. "We may," he said in the

[1] A Lecture by the late Rev. John Hunter, D.D. It was first written in 1904 and formed one of a course delivered in the King's Weigh House Church, London, on Religious Leaders of the 19th century.

closing years of his life, "have a more compact system, more complex organisation, and more elaborate mechanism for the accomplishment of our work, and with them weaker life and poorer truth." But let us not say of him, as was said by some one at the time of his death, that he was the last of the Independents. A few may still be found possessing their souls in patience even in these days of organisations and committees.

In the Independent ministry he found the freest and most joyful exercise of all his powers. He carried into it his whole intellectual and spiritual force. He often used to say that there is no position which possesses such high advantage for speaking truth and doing good as that of a true Independent minister of a true Independent Church. The position, in spite of its isolation, is one of great advantage, yet it needs a strong and brave man like Baldwin Brown to show fully what real advantage is in it, and to make the best of its opportunity. It also needs a congregation with a high ideal of its relation to its minister and a deep sense of individual as well as corporate loyalty and responsibility. More perhaps than any other church order, and in this lies its danger as well as its strength, Independency opens to men of natural capacity a path to positions of influence and honour—an order therefore which has its recognised place among the powers which are moving forward the progress of society.

Unlike many Independent ministers, Baldwin Brown cannot be described as a self-made man. Born in 1820 at King's Bench Walk, Temple, the eldest son of Dr. James Baldwin Brown, barrister-at-law, he was originally intended to follow his father's profession, and kept his terms at the Inner Temple for that purpose.

Graduating at the age of eighteen at the University of

London, he was among the recipients of the first degrees granted by that body. But he had not far advanced in the study of law when a critical change of feeling took place, which made him turn his back on the ambition and fame which, with his gifts and fitness, must have been so fascinating, and exchange the career of a barrister for that of an Independent teacher and preacher of the religion of Christ. He had received that call which the ordination service of the Church of England recognises when it requires every candidate to declare that he is inwardly moved by the Holy Ghost to take on himself this office and ministration. A solemn and wonderful declaration. It stamps a man with a Divine seal; sets him before his fellows as inwardly impelled to do a Divine thing. Office in the Church of Christ is not a profession but a vocation; not something which a man chooses, but for which he is chosen; to which, he does not advance because he will, but because he must, and from which he is not at liberty to turn away.

Baldwin Brown always ascribed his determination to be come a Christian minister to the influence of Carlyle. In a letter written by him to Carlyle in after days he says: "My debt of gratitude to you is not nominal, but a real thing. I fell in accidentally with *Sartor Resartus* many years ago, when I most needed it, when it gave shape to very much that I was dimly feeling, and a voice to very much that I was somewhat wildly thinking, and, more than that, it very much widened and deepened my understanding of the command, 'Walk by faith and not by sight.' To the course of study and thought to which the meditations of that period have led me, I owe it that I am not a member of a purely worldly profession for which I was then educating, but a preacher of the living Word, into the proclamation of which I can at any rate throw as much of earnestness and life as I have in myself."

After spending some time as a theological student at Highbury College, where, he once said, he learned at least two things, patience, and how to shave with cold water, he was called to Derby, and became the first minister of the London Road Independent Church there. He at once drew attention as a preacher. A fine presence, attractive speech, choice style, fresh treatment of hackneyed pulpit themes, wide sympathies and intense earnestness, made him a preacher sought after from the outset, especially by thoughtful persons.

Very early in his public life, he came under the influence of Macleod Campbell, Maurice and A. J. Scott. In a theological retrospect of fifty years he gave, I remember, a very high place to Macleod Campbell, whose book on the Atonement he considered to be the greatest theological work since the Reformation. Like George Macdonald, he might be truthfully described as a Maurician. Though he called no one master he was always proud to confess his great indebtedness to Maurice and to speak of him as his friend. But again and again he told me that he owed most to A. J. Scott, of whom he always spoke with profound veneration. Baldwin Brown came under his influence when Scott was preaching to a small congregation at Woolwich and delivering occasional lectures in London on literary, philosophical and religious subjects. "I so loved and honoured Scott," he once wrote; "to me he was the prince of preachers and the saintliest of saints. While he lived I felt myself a disciple in spirit to him at any rate. I acted under his counsels upon all the great occasions of my life. When I was laid aside by illness from preaching he stepped forward for months to occupy my pulpit. Listening to his words I first felt the inspiration of a preacher's spirit thrill through my being. He lit the flame of passion for the ministry which, thanks be to God, has never burnt

low on the altar of my heart." His estimate of A. J. Scott he has also left on record in the dedication of two books. In the last address I heard Baldwin Brown deliver, he introduced a quotation from Scott in these words: "The wisest and most prophetic man whom I have ever known said, a generation ago, a theology that shuts out human interests has taught men a humanity that shuts out God."

At Derby, Baldwin Brown slowly gathered a good congregation; but before long there arose suspicions of his soundness in the faith, which caused those who could not recognise Christian truth except in its traditional dress to fall away from him; but there were not wanting numbers who listened gladly to his free, brave words, received his teaching with eagerness and repaid it with loyal affection. His biographer quotes one friend as saying long afterwards: "Ever since the morning when he stood up in the pulpit at Derby, a handsome young stripling, and delivered his first message, which startled and aroused some, if not all, who heard him, I have never had a wavering thought as to my faith in him." [1] At the end of three years he accepted a call to Claylands Chapel, Clapham, where he soon drew around him a numerous company of thoughtful and sympathetic men and women, and where he remained till a new and larger church was built for him in the Brixton Road, with which his name was associated until his death. A church, I may add, with a trust as open as the trusts of the old Presbyterian chapels of England, dedicated simply to the worship of God and the preaching of the gospel of Jesus Christ.

In his early days, and even in his prime, Baldwin Brown was a preacher of a new order—so striking was the contrast

[1] *In Memoriam. James Baldwin Brown*, by his wife. J Clarke and Co. 1884. P. 8.

which he presented to the preachers who had the ear of the religious world when he was young. The old hard theology and the venerable classification of men were still in vogue in our churches, but both were beginning to wear out. A larger thought of the ways of God was shaping itself, a new spirit was abroad, and he was one of the very first to catch it. Thomas Binney,[1] of course, had done much to prepare the way for a larger theology, though he was, as Brown once said, a somewhat timid and hesitating theologian. Binney was in tune with the new spirit, and more profoundly than he knew, yet he always had, even to the last, a certain non-committal attitude towards its theological expression. His sympathies, his gleams of intuition, and more spontaneous utterances were always in advance of the systematic theology of his elaborate discourses. It was not so much by his own direct and positive contributions to theology as by the manly tone of his thinking and preaching that Binney struck in with the advancing current of thought and life. It was said of him that his power, which almost rose to genius, lay in the strength of his grasp on the moral manhood of his hearers whereby he was able to lift them to a more manly and vigorous life. If the manhood of men is enlarged, men will themselves enlarge their theology.

The first thing which Baldwin Brown published after he came to London was an address delivered on some special occasion, entitled, *The Young Ministry; its Relation to the Age.* It was published some years before I was born; but reading it through the other day in the British Museum, I found not a sentiment in it which is not as applicable to the ministry, both young and old, now as then. If it were delivered to-day men would still be struck by its freshness

[1] Minister of the King's Weigh House Church, E.C. This church was only moved to the West End in 1891.

and power. It discusses three characteristics which must be possessed by a young ministry if it is to sustain a right relation to the age. It must, first, be a ministry which confers not with flesh and blood but derives its truth directly from the original source of truth. Divine Wisdom, he says, hath a spell no wisdom of this world can borrow: God's voice has a music no man's voice can mimic, but that spell becomes broken and that music becomes marred as it passes through earthly channels, therefore let him who would speak truth to this age draw it fresh from its fountain —God. Let us not bit and bridle liberty in our training schools. Let us have faith that amid a band of independent students of truth God's Spirit will preserve a spiritual unity of which all other unions are but the mechanical imitation. It must, secondly, be a ministry of stern independence, leading men, not led by them, relying solely for any influence and success it may have or seek to have on the simple truth of the message it delivers. Independency, in contrast with other church systems, seems to be the assertion that in man's spiritual relations nothing can rule him but the truth of God; and that nothing else has a commission even to attempt it. It says, "if we cannot do a Divine work in the Church by a Divine Spirit, at least let us not be guilty of the mockery of doing man's work and calling it God's. . . . We do not want a succession of ministers who carry on the plans and operations commenced by their predecessors; we need men each of whom brings with him a fresh living power. . . . Paul presents to us the type of a true Independent ministry. He lays down its law when he says, 'By manifestation of the truth we commend ourselves to every man's conscience in the sight of God.' If our Churches are to maintain their ground and minister to the age, we must have a succession of men who both heartily believe this truth, and dare to act upon

it." . . . "The young ministry must, thirdly, study honestly and understand thoroughly its relation to literature generally, to philosophy and science especially, and the movements connected with man's social welfare, which are so strikingly a feature of the times."

To that ideal of true and noble religious leadership Baldwin Brown was faithful all through the years, obeying at eve the voice he heard at prime. He did not disappoint the hope and confidence he awakened as do so many who, starting well, end in treading the ruts they once exhorted all to forsake. According to the pattern shown him on the mount he strove with his whole heart to shape his ministry. He never faltered in his witness, never ceased to advance, never ceased to be a leader.

What Carlyle finely said of his father may be said of Baldwin Brown as a Christian minister: "The thing he had nothing to do with, he did nothing with." All his reading and study and writing from the very outset were in the direction of his work. His delicate and disciplined instinct quickly discerned the line which separates legitimate work from work which cannot be engaged in without implying a lack of full consecration to the office he held. He was far from being one-sided and partial; his culture and sympathy and his interpretation of religion lifted him above everything narrow and made of him what may be styled a universal man. But his universality did not consist in a meddling with many things in their separate forms and aspects, but in an earnest striving to illuminate and pervade all things with the truth and spirit which he held in trust. Indeed a great part of his power was a large grasp of the human side of the Christian Gospel, a clear and comprehensive view of the relation of human activities, affections and aspirations to the Kingdom of

God on earth. In seeking to make his message touch at every point the aims and various interests of men there was no dissipation of spiritual force. What he said and did, in the way indicated, was done not as a party politician, or mere social reformer, but as a Christian teacher and preacher on the watch to claim for Christ the Kingdoms of the world—the Kingdom of the family, the Kingdom of the wider human relations, the Kingdom of trade, the Kingdom of culture, the Kingdom of politics. "It may be a sad confession of lukewarmness," he once said, "in the eyes of some, but I am in no sense a political dissenter or a party politician." Yet he was full of deep broad sympathy with the movements of his time and with all honest endeavours to set right what is wrong in human society.

Though he hated to define himself by negatives, yet he loved his Nonconformity, chiefly because of the religious freedom and power which it seemed to him to assure. What he said of his uncle, Dr. Raffles, might be said of himself: "I do not think that he would have felt that he gained much by making a man a nonconformist, except as he made him a wider, freer and more intelligent Christian." It was the gospel of Nonconformity—the gospel of spiritual freedom and independence—he preached. What the Americans would call "its platform" he left willingly to men of another order and school. And his Nonconformity, though intense, was eminently catholic. It was indeed his hatred of exclusiveness and his loyalty to the ideal of the Church of Christ that made him stand all his days where he did.

There was much in the ritual of the Church of England which he loved, but he could not endure its exclusiveness. Schemes of comprehensiveness he regarded with little favour, nor had he the faintest hope of their success. Independency, at least as he understood it, had less of sectarian-

ism and more of catholicity than any other church order because it put Christ first and fellowship next. "It is because Independency is not a church system that I cleave to it. A company of men and women meeting for religious worship and teaching and work is not a sect. Any number of such companies meeting for brotherly counsel and co-operation is not a sect. It is the simplest form of church organisation in which the Christian life can nourish itself and act on society."

At the outset of his ministry in London, and indeed for many years, Baldwin Brown's success was not great—at least in the eyes of those who even in the Temple of God apply the standards of the market. He counted the measure of his faithfulness to be the measure of his success. As he always said in the charges he addressed to young ministers—I can recall his tones as he said these words to Dr. Forsyth and to the late Dr. Berry on the day of their ordination—"Count faithfulness your true success. Let us never say of you, Ah! he is a self-seeker like the rest. Your reward is not an earthly one. You must die in order to touch the crown." Binney, on the occasion of Brown's semi-jubilee, congratulated him that at last he had got a noble church and a noble congregation without any laying out or planning for mere popularity. That indeed was the last thing any one could lay to his charge. So far from catering for mere popularity he pursued a course which drove it far from him.

All his work was on a high plane. Simplicity and reality he loved and cherished. He distrusted all loud, sensational methods of church activity, and was early convinced that some modern experiments for making religion and the churches attractive would end in vulgarising religion and desecrating the Church. In a discourse on church questions entitled *The Popular Pulpit and its Probable Fruits*,

preached in 1858, there is a striking passage which might have been written of present day conditions: "The earnest desire to gather great multitudes to hear the Gospel, which has been growing for many years to its present height, has got itself associated with a system in which all the worst elements of vain-glory and puffery are pressed into the service of the Kingdom of God. I speak of a system; the thing is no longer represented by one or two men, it has grown into a system. There is a deliberate system of manufacture of public excitement at work, with regard to certain notable preachers, by newspaper paragraphs, by striking advertisements, and outrageous placards which is precisely modelled upon the method which Mr. Barnum has associated with his name all over the world. I am not stating it too strongly. I have watched the system at work with sorrow and shame; and I do greatly dread this tendency to accept the verdict of a crowd as decisive of the truth or the spiritual power of preaching—this intrusion into the most sacred region of those principles and methods which are already working such deadly evils in secular life, whereby the goodness of a man's ware is accepted according to the length and strength of his advertisements, and a man's power to guide and rule is measured by the cheers he may draw from public meetings. We who are set to guard the purities of spiritual powers are betraying them. With us success covers the multitude of sins. No matter what arts of adulation, what the preceding fanfare of trumpets, what studious getting up of the necessary excitement may have heralded a ministration, if there are but crowds, impressive, universal excitement and apparent success, we accept it in a moment, we find heaven's hall-mark on it at once, though every conviction of what is spiritual has been wounded to the quick by the methods employed."

From the beginning of his ministry to its close Baldwin Brown was distinguished by his broad and ever-broadening views of truth. His central ideas were the Universal Fatherhood of God, a Fatherhood that meant suffering and sacrifice in the Divine Nature, and the Kingdom of heaven upon earth, a human society and civilisation truly and completely Christian.

The publication in 1859 of his first volume of importance, a series of discourses entitled *The Divine Life in Man*, brought to a crisis the suspicion of his teaching which had existed for some years in the minds of the champions of Calvinistic orthodoxy. The book was assailed in the various literary organs of the religious world. Its main ideas are now so freely and widely received by all churches, that it is difficult to understand the storm which these noble and beautiful discourses raised. The author suffered deeply from the opposition which it provoked. "At this period," his biographer says, "his isolation was complete; as a public teacher he was discredited. Even the question of ways and means pressed heavily upon him." [1] But he did not complain. He took a manly view of the sufferings he had to endure, In a letter to the *Spectator* long afterwards he said: "Men have to suffer sharply, we are told, if they venture out of the beaten track in our Ministry. I answer that the beaten track is a fairly broad one, and if any feel pressed in the spirit to wander further, they ought to be prepared to suffer. We hear a great deal too much about these sufferings. It was not by swimming with the current that the first preachers of the Kingdom turned 'upside down' the world. There are magpies enough in all churches, it ought not to be too easy for them to chatter novelties. The suffering which attends on the opening-out of new truths is one of the blessed pains of

[1] *In Memoriam. James Baldwin Brown*, p. 16.

progress. It is Heaven's own ordinance to secure that the men who are set forth as leaders shall have strength not to speak only but to endure."[1]

Do we not want everywhere preachers of that manly temper? The preacher who before preaching first feels the pulse of his congregation in order to learn just how much or how little of God's truth they can bear is not a preacher that will ever serve real and living needs. A gentleman said to me the other day, speaking about his minister: "He preaches a really good, straight, bold sermon once a month, but unfortunately he spends the rest of the month explaining it all away." That sort of pastorship in religion, which is the weakness and curse of all the churches, Established and Free, was not to Baldwin Brown's liking. At the close of a series of sermons in which he argued against the doctrines of endless torment and annihilation and in favour of universal Redemption (long before the late Dean Farrar did so), he said to his congregation: 'It has cost me more to carry through this task than many of you dream. What may be the immediate issue to myself and my ministry I know not; but necessity seems to be laid upon me, therefore I speak."

For too many years he suffered from misunderstanding, misrepresentation, prejudice. He suffered especially from the fear and distrust of the more politic leaders of the Free Churches, many of whom saw clearly enough the truth he battled for, yet shook their heads and questioned his wisdom. They were afraid of what he might say. "A little more compliance," they whispered, "a little more concession; not such bold statements. Why disturb those at ease in Zion, especially the most liberal supporters of our various societies? The people must be educated you know, step by step, here a little and there a little. We

[1] *The Spectator*, November 29, 1873.

must have tact, sir, and caution and prudence." I am not exaggerating. That sort of criticism of Baldwin Brown was heard everywhere at one time, and alas! it still represents the ethics of the churches. It is safe men most of the churches want, and it is only safe men they put into office. Only when the brave uncompromising man is dead do we begin to praise him and lay our cheap wreaths on his grave.

It required rare heroism to brave and bear for many years the prejudice and stupidity, the much fear and the little faith which Baldwin Brown encountered and which he was too keenly sensitive not to feel, though it never provoked him to evil. Distrusted and disliked by guardians of orthodoxy, ecclesiastical politicians and their supporters, he had many disciples among the younger Congregational ministry and the more thoughtful lay members of Congregational churches all over England. Long before his death he had lived down all prejudice and had come to be recognised and appreciated for what he was —" a great Christian preacher if ever there was one." [1]

In some respects he was the best preacher English Independents ever had. It is true he was not an orator; his eloquence was seldom of the kind which is described as thrilling. He had little of that gift of fluent appeal and persuasion which lays hold of that most important individual, the man in the street. He gathered his disciples, but seldom in crowds; only in his last years had he even a large congregation. Yet he possessed in an exceptional measure all the endowments which a preacher needs, especially a preacher for people who go to the House of God not to be entertained or even merely pleased, but to breathe an atmosphere of high and bracing thought and of

[1] R. H. Hutton in the *Spectator*, June 28, 1884.

reverent worship. His personality was a striking one, and made a deep and lasting impression on those with whom he came in contact. There was in him also a breadth of faculty and force which in any position must have won for him a distinguished place and name. He ever gave one the impression of high cultivation. Some one, I remember, once described him as Matthew Arnold in the pulpit; but if so, it was not Matthew Arnold the critic, but Matthew Arnold the poet—though I think he resembled Browning more than Arnold. His discourses were full of the highest and best culture of the time. Intellectual they were, but not coldly intellectual, for the intellect in them was suffused in the rich warm glow of feeling and sympathy, and influenced by moral and religious earnestness. His earnestness was always impressive—at times even awfully impressive, as when he warned young men against besetting temptations or denounced our social hypocrisies and evils. He was imbued with a fine historic sense, which was shown not only in his lectures on the ancient philosophers and the medieval saints, but in his treatment of the Old Testament in the pulpit. His love of beauty and his imaginative faculty gave wealth and ornament to his style though he never sacrificed a particle of direct force for any rhetorical advantage. Strength and beauty were in him blended in natural endowment, blended in culture, blended in character, blended in all his pulpit work.

His sermons were not easily produced. They were the fruit of much intense thinking and they reveal a studied and nervously conscientious effort to keep on a high level. His very life went into them—the inner life of thought and feeling and experience which the Good Shepherd gives for his sheep. He gave himself with his sermons. I have heard a preacher denounced by a Hyde Park orator as "a seventh day worker and earning his living cheap at that."

Seventh day! That is, indeed, the true preacher's easiest day. I often hear people praise the self-denying devotion of Ritualistic and Roman Catholic priests because they are ever on their feet, calling here and calling there, attending this meeting and that, ready to visit the sick and the dying at any hour of the day or night. I say not one single word in disparagement of all that zealous activity. But the work of the Catholic priest or Nonconformist organiser and overseer is almost mechanical work when compared with the work of the preacher who puts brain and heart and soul into his sermons. Is there no self-denial in that secret silent work which only God knows? "A worker in words," says some one; but what if words be the vehicle of thought and passion, flashes of light, channels of inspiration, benedictions, or half-battles, as was said of Luther's words? Jesus was a preacher, and it is His words more than His miracles which still move the world. Protestantism, our Protestant Nonconformity especially, has done its best and most characteristic work by preaching, and it will have departed alike from its historic principle and the characteristic method of Christianity when in its churches preaching takes a subordinate place. The sermon that takes up into itself the true spirit of worship spread Christianity at the beginning, and it is the instrument by which all great reformations and revivals of religion have been brought about.

Baldwin Brown took his place in the literature of his time and, by the way in which he did it, he added prestige to the Independent pulpit and Church. The late editor of the *Spectator*, Richard Holt Hutton, said of one volume of his discourses that "they were models of what pulpit discourses ought to be . . . they relate to the business of life and are replete with discriminative counsel in reference

to it. Breathing the purest spirituality, they are also full of practical wisdom."

His book, *The Soul's Exodus and Pilgrimage*, which I first read when I was eighteen, introduced me into a new world of pulpit eloquence. I can recall the stile of the country road where I sat when I read some of its glowing passages—passages which gave a new charm to the landscape and a new tenderness to the light of that summer evening long ago. *Idolatries Old and New, Their Cause and Cure*, though published in 1867, is still the best work I know on Ritualism, because it deals not with the superficial aspects of the matter which fill the vision of so many anti-ritualists, but discusses principles in a wise, liberal and dignified way. His book on *The Higher Life, its Reality, Experience and Destiny* contains some of the noblest discourses to be found in modern pulpit literature. A few of them deal in a helpful way with some of the speculations of physical science. *First Principles of Ecclesiastical Truth*, not so widely known and valued as it ought to be, is perhaps his greatest and ablest book. The chapters on the Infallible Book, the Infallible Church, the doctrine of Christ, the Christian Commonwealth, are remarkably brilliant, full of fine insight and far-reaching suggestion.

I remember once when he preached for me in York that my friend Dr. Forsyth, he and I drove out the next morning to the battlefield of Stamford Bridge—he was always eager to see historic places and scenes. He told us then that he was meditating a still larger book on the same subject which he thought of calling *The Kingdom of Christ.* The book was never written. The night when no man can work came, too quickly—if not for him, yet for us.

It was his custom to deliver a course of week-evening lectures to his congregation almost every winter on historical and kindred subjects. Some of these lectures were after-

wards delivered to philosophical and literary societies in various parts of the country, and were printed in the *Contemporary* and other reviews. I remember hearing three of them, "The Heroes of the Age of Elizabeth," "The Last Great Dream of the Crusade" and "Alfred the Great" —lectures which were admired for their picturesque description and genuine historical insight. The volume entitled *Stoics and Saints*, which was published after his death, contains his lectures on Epictetus, Marcus Aurelius, St. Bernard and St. Francis of Assisi, and exemplifies the masterly way in which he could deal critically and in a broad impartial spirit with Pagan and Christian systems.

"All human work," says Carlyle, "is transitory and small in itself; only the worker thereof and the spirit that dwelleth in him is significant." Judged by this test Baldwin Brown's life is significant. Elevating, quickening, helpful as were his sermons and as are his writings, the man himself, in his whole spirit, bearing and influence, far exceeded these. He had not only the qualities which placed him unquestionably among the great religious teachers of the nineteenth century, but he had also the qualities which drew to him a personal love and reverence such as are accorded to few and make his memory, after the lapse of many years, still live in many hearts—

> As mournful light
> That broods above the fallen sun
> And dwells in heaven half the night.

The most distinguishing quality of Baldwin Brown's character was his chivalry. He was the most chivalrous man I have ever known or ever hope to know now. He was always ready—I may almost say eager, to stand by oppressed causes and unpopular movements, and to

make himself the champion of those whom he thought wronged.

"It was the instinct of his fine militancy," Dr. Forsyth once said, "to leave to the gods the conquering side and to take the conquered for his own." So it was in his championship of Thomas Lynch, of the heretics of the Leicester Conference, and of my friend Stannard of Huddersfield. But his chivalry was more than an impulse or sentiment, it was a principle. It was quickened and nourished by his love of truth and justice, and by his Christian faith. He was profoundly convinced that the Divine Spirit speaks by many voices and in divers manners, and that the Churches ought to listen without prejudice or distrust to whatever claims that origin, and to try it in a generous way and with an earnest desire to recognise any new truth or new aspect of an old truth that may have been revealed to the earnest seeker. For example, in one of his lectures he pleads that the whole question of eternal punishment be left an open question in the churches and that great liberty on that and kindred questions be freely granted to young ministers. "I do not speak for myself. I have borne so much opposition and mistrust for speaking what seemed to me to be the truth in past years, that I can bear more, if it must be, with tolerable patience. I speak for my young brethren, whose work is very difficult, whose battle is very hard, harder than many of you know, in such times as these. Let me appeal to you as one who has been for a full generation in the very midst of the conflict; do not fire into the troops who are bravely fighting your battle; do not blight with your distrust the men who are struggling hard, through many errors and failures no doubt, but still with honest and truth-loving hearts, to discover and disclose the harmonies which *must* subsist between the word of Scripture and the deepest

needs, experiences and convictions of the great world of men." [1]

Referring to this quality of chivalry in the funeral sermon I preached in his church in 1884, I said: "When will young ministers in their intellectual and ecclesiastical difficulties and struggles find again such a friend, so large in justice and charity, so full of sympathy, so ready to trust them, help them and stand by them even to the risking of his own good name and reputation? It was the highest tribute that could be paid to his memory that so many educated, thoughtful, enthusiastic young men found in him one they could love and trust—the best of friends." God ever helps men through men. So truth comes down out of the heavens and the voice that speaks becomes a human voice and the hand that guides a human hand and the life that uplifts a human life, and that beautiful prophecy of the ancient days never fails to find fresh and larger fulfilment: "Behold a man shall be as a hiding-place from the wind and a covert from the tempest, as streams of water in a dry place and as the shadow of a great rock in a weary land."

JOHN HUNTER.

[1] *The Doctrine of Annihilation in the Light of the Gospel of Love* (1875), pp. 12–13.

JESUS AND BAPTISM.

The Evidence of the Fourth Gospel.

It may be admitted that modern students of the New Testament would not readily subscribe to the statement of the Prayer Book Catechism that the two Sacraments were "ordained by Christ Himself" without some reservation, or at least without demanding some closer definition of what "ordaining" by "Christ" means. Take the case of Baptism. The careful and intelligent reader of the Gospels, even "in the vulgar tongue," is well aware that the earliest Gospel, in the form in which it has been transmitted, contains no allusion to any such institution of the Church's initiatory sacrament; although he might perhaps be inclined to speculate on the possibility of a mention thereof in the lost conclusion of St. Mark. Nor has that varied and elastic material from a source, or combination of sources, to which the non-committal title of "Q" has come to be accorded, anything bearing directly on the subject. And the observant student would look in vain for any allusion to such ordaining at the close of St. Luke's record, wherein also no command to baptize is included in the Master's instructions to the Twelve or the Seventy; yet this evangelist was quite familiar, on the evidence of the second volume of his work-with the Christian practice of the initiatory rite into the Brotherhood. Our reader would realise that the charge to baptize is only to be found at the end of the Gospel which came to be termed—from whatever cause is here immaterial —"according to Matthew."

Having arrived at this stage, perplexing problems arise, to which there is no generally accepted solution. Is this final command *genuine* ? is it, that is, as all extant texts testify, original in the Matthean composition ? But still more important, is it *authentic* ? that is, does the charge to baptize all the nations proceed from the Lord Himself ; or has a practice which had its origin among the primitive disciples at some time and place uncertainly defined—apart from the conflicting and disputed evidence of *Acts*—been ascribed to the Founder in a manner not in agreement with historic fact ? Further, if such authenticity be admitted and the Matthean narrative taken at its face value, associated as it is with an appearance after death, is it not indeed strictly a communication from the heavenly Christ rather than an institution of the earthly Jesus ? It is recorded as emanating from the living personality of the " risen " Lord, the Spirit of Jesus, invading the consciousness of those who " saw " Him, by means of an " audition " in this sense which was accepted as a command.

Again, the careful student is arrested by the fact that there is no trace of the three-fold formula, or indeed of any such instruction to baptize *Gentiles* in the *Acts*, the Lukan narrative which traces the spread of the Glad-tidings from the Holy City to Rome ; but that Baptism, wherever reference is made to a form of words in connexion therewith, is " into " (or " in ") " the name of (the Lord) Jesus (Christ)." And the Pauline letters reflect similar conditions. There is so far no fixed form. And the evidence of the *Didaché*, in a familiar passage, tends now to be discounted both as to its date and genuineness. This non-use of the later ecclesiastical formula would scarcely be explicable, to say the least, if it had been known to the Apostles, and acknowledged by them as a definite *and universal* injunction coming from the Master Himself, else had it been utilised from the outset. More-

over, it is safe to infer from extant evidence that Eusebius was aware of texts of the first Gospel which contained the simpler reading "in my name." But we are not concerned here to estimate the value of a tentative reconstruction, with its elusive probabilities, of the evidence of the *Acts*, such as that just set forth, for example, in *The Beginnings of Christianity*, i. 332 ff. All that we are desirous to inquire in this short paper is if the conflicting and apparently self-contradictory evidence of the text of the Fourth Gospel has any light to throw upon this subject, concerning which the testimony of the Synoptic records is such as has been briefly indicated. This Johannine evidence we will now proceed to investigate.

It is probably correct to assume that the author of the latest Gospel was familiar with the earliest, the fundamental narrative and framework for the other Synoptists; and with the latter more or less, although it would be precarious to affirm that they were already in the form in which they have been transmitted to us. There was no necessity, therefore, it is commonly supposed, for this evangelist to recount afresh the institution of either "Sacrament of the Gospel," especially taking into consideration the fact of his having written at a later period. But the argument from silence has its limitations and its dangers, and is always two-edged. For it is at least conceivable that the author might have desired to throw back the institution of one or both sacraments, or even to challenge the fact of their ordination by Christ Himself.

Let us see then what, if anything, can be reasonably deduced from the Johannine references to Baptism in connexion with Jesus during His ministry, seeing that in this account no allusion is made to any post-resurrection ordaining of the initiatory rite, but only to an inbreathing of "holy spirit." And it is remarkable that the new birth "from

spirit " is characteristic of this Gospel. Only once does the mention of water occur in this connexion ; and then, although the authorities afford no variant (iii. 5), Justin's apparent if loose quotation (Ap. i. 61) gives us pause : while, on the other hand, a verse or two later (8), ancient Syro-Latin texts insert " water and " into this subsequent and final allusion in the Nicodemus episode to the new birth.

Perhaps it should be remarked first that the writer, in recording John's testimony to the official deputation from Jerusalem, relates that the Baptist answered their challenge as to his office and functions with the statement (i.26) of his own practice of baptizing with or in water, while a Greater than himself was amongst them, still unknown. But he is *not* represented in this narrative as asserting that the One who should come after him would baptize at all, whether with water or with spirit, although to some at least among the Jews baptism with the Spirit was regarded as a function of the Messiah. And with this view the synoptic accounts of the witness of John agree. Here again the risk and uncertainty of an argument from silence are manifest. Wellhausen, for example, goes beyond the evidence when he contends—in the light of that other fact that the Fourth Gospel does not recount the actual Baptism of Jesus—that Jesus is the Messiah without being baptized, as well as without Himself baptizing (*Das Evang. Joh.*, 10).

In face of the Forerunner's silence in this passage, however, we are confronted by mutually contradictory statements a little later in the story of this Gospel as to the Master's practice of baptizing. We are first informed that after the initial ministry associated with Jerusalem (according to the scheme of the Fourth Gospel as it stands) Jesus and His disciples went into the Judaean country, " and there he tarried with them and used to baptize," while John, perhaps not many miles away—the locality is uncertain—was doing

the same (iii. 22 f.). But subsequently, we are told in a verse textually doubtful (iv. 1), that "Jesus was making and baptizing more disciples than John." This is immediately corrected or qualified (according to the present text) by the statement "and yet Jesus himself used not to baptize but his disciples" (2). Thus we are faced by a problem as yet, to the present writer's knowledge, not satisfactorily solved.

Did the Master baptize or did He not? Is the correction one of fact and part of the original document of this Gospel; or is it an editor's or primitive reader's or scribe's qualification by way of gloss or interpolation? And is the verse only or the little section secondary? If we assume, as Westcott did, that both verses are genuine, we may adopt his explanation that, being a symbolic act, it befitted the functions of a servant rather than of the Master. But would an author be guilty of so patent a contradiction within a few lines, or write his account so confusedly? Still, even conceding its genuineness, it might be possible to take the verse as a hint that Baptism, as it was known in the Christian churches as a sacrament with which writer and readers were perfectly familiar, was not the institution of the Master Himself but of the disciples. For, in Westcott's words again, "the sacrament of baptism presupposes the Death and Resurrection of Christ." However, if the motive for departure ascribed to Jesus in the first verse—the jealousy of the authorities in Jerusalem—be historically trustworthy, assuming also for the present argument this initial Judaean ministry to be a fact, then one must admit that the second verse most readily suggests itself to be the correction by another hand (so Wellhausen, etc.) on the grounds of known historic fact or else on the strength of the silence of the records of the Ministry already current.

Nevertheless, even so the outstanding difficulty is not eliminated. For the Johannine narrative as it stands states

clearly in an intermediate verse (iii. 26), despite its awkwardness, that before the imprisonment of the Baptist—whether the implication of simultaneous work (24a) be a corrective gloss or not—the latter's disciples, jealous of an invasion of his functions by a rival prophet, inform him that the One to whom he bore witness "is baptizing" and crowds are flocking to Him. It is to be noted that again the act of the Baptism is unmentioned. The natural conclusion from this is that Jesus in His preliminary activity, before the Galilean ministry of the Synoptists, and while John was still summoning men to repentance and bestowing a symbolic baptism in anticipation of an impending doom, was constituting Himself quite independently a partner in administering the preparatory water-baptism which John bestowed upon those who came to him in penitence and confession. For, as Westcott wrote long ago, "it was not and indeed could not be an anticipation of the Christian sacrament which it foreshadowed."

From these conflicting or contradictory statements in the Fourth Gospel according to the transmitted text two results appear to emerge. 1. There is no hint of an institution of anything of the nature of Christian Baptism by the Lord Jesus during His earthly ministry or indeed after His resurrection. This silence or omission may be due to the partially complementary character of the author's interpretative narrative, either because the final charge was known to him (possibly) from the close of the first Gospel in its original form, or even (less possibly) from the lost conclusion of the second; or else because the sacramental rite of initiation into the Society was the familiar current practice of the Church in his day, and thus required no historical substantiation. On the other hand, despite ecclesiastical custom, it would be at least open to argue that the author (or corrector, as the case may be) was unaware of any

ordaining of Baptism by the Lord Himself during His mortal career or in one of the Resurrection manifestations. If this use of the precarious hypothesis of an author "knowing nothing" about some fact or function which he does not mention were allowed any validity, the further inference would have to be drawn that the originating of the Christian sacrament of union with Christ and with the Brotherhood of believers was due to the Spirit-inspired decision and action of apostles or disciples after Pentecost; a practice fundamentally Jewish being thus given a new significance, but still restricted to Jews alone. This opens up the question of the evidence of *Acts* on the subject, which is itself a problem causing keen criticism of sources and discussion of discrepancies at the present time.

2. There is, however, a hint that the author of the narrative was cognisant in some manner unknown to us of a fact which none of the synoptic Gospels mention; or else was desirous, in view of persuading local circles of the Baptist's followers to join the Christian community, to establish belief in it as a fact; namely, that Jesus at some period of His ministry carried on personally (iii. 22, 26; iv. 1), or through His disciples (should iv. 2 be original), the preparatory rite of John. But if this assumed fact, whether in the guise of a delegated or personal act, be deemed by critical students of Christian origins historically untrue by reason of the silence of the other extant records, it would be a justifiable inference to draw that the evangelist was in this way seeking to provide an antecedent corroboration or an earlier foundation for this Christian sacrament in the practice and during the lifetime of "the Word become flesh." In other words, it might be argued, as hinted above, that possibly the writer was attempting to meet the difficulties of likely converts from among "the disciples of John" in his time and locality, by the virtual affirmation—whether his-

torically well founded or not—that Jesus was alike the Continuator of John's Baptism and also the Originator through the Spirit's guidance of the richer sacrament of Christian initiation as practised by the Church.

This brief paper is intended to raise questions rather than to answer them. But they are such as will have to be considered in connexion with and in relation to that discussion of the sources and evidence of *Acts*, which is one of the most live problems in the modern criticism of the New Testament.

The above article has been written for some months. But it has been withheld until Professor Stanton's third volume *The Fourth Gospel* was available, in case the latter should afford any notable illumination or offer a solution of the problem involved. To the present writer this most valuable work of an old teacher and friend does not appear to do so; the obscurity is not yet dispelled. What he says, however, concerning the other Sacrament is found to be in agreement *mutatis mutandis* with one line of argument adopted above: "the constant repetition in the Christian assemblies of the rite . . . may have made it so familiar that it did not seem necessary to record it" (256). The foregoing paper, therefore, may be fruitful in stimulating others to attack the difficulty, and to assist in producing some consensus of opinion among students which may enable the contradiction in this matter between the synoptic and Johannine accounts to be resolved.

EDWARD WILLIAM WINSTANLEY.

THE FUGITIVE WANDERER'S PSALM.

Dr. Briggs, one of the latest commentators on this psalm, has declared it to be composite : he finds that it consists of three poems, or parts of poems, which have been united into one composition (*Intern. Crit. Commentary*, Psalms, ii. 491 ff.). Poem A consists of verses 7–12, and ends with the words, *And the night shineth as the day*. " This singularly beautiful Psalm," writes Dr. Briggs, " is complete and symmetrical in itself." Poem B consists of verses 1–6 *plus* verses 13–16 (ver. 14 is a gloss !) and verses 23, 24. Poem C consists of verse 17 with verses 21, 22, and some fragments ; verse 18 is another gloss.

It is not proposed in this paper to criticise Dr. Briggs' scheme in detail ; but rather to offer an alternative treatment of the text and to attempt to trace a connexion between its different parts. But it is worth while to remind the reader from the beginning that the linguistic colour of this psalm tells heavily against Dr. Briggs' dissection of it. The language is characterised to an extraordinary degree by Aramaisms. This characteristic prevails throughout the psalm ; it is found in verses 2, 3, 4, 8, (12 ?], 19, 20, 23 ; it is a link between the different parts of the poem.

The author was, it seems, a wanderer in the world ; his " speech bewrays " him. Perhaps no other psalm contains so many strange expressions, Aramaic words in the place of Hebrew, and laboured turns even in the mother tongue. Possibly in the course of his wanderings he had half forgotten his own language. In any case his psalm is in substance an acknowledgment of Jehovah's wonderful care for him while he wandered.

To the Eastern man, to the Semite at least, religion was and is local. For him God dwelt not in the wide heaven,

but in the Beth-el or in the high place of his native village. His god stayed at home. So the man of the East was (like Jacob) surprised if he learnt that God was aware of him, even when he was on his travels (Gen. xxviii. 16). The Psalmist, who began by sharing this feeling, tells the story of the experiences which corrected it; he writes half in thankfulness, half in wonder. In one short verse he sums up the record of his life:

> JEHOVAH, Thou hast searched me,
> And Thou hast acknowledged me (ver. 1).

This is a tremendous statement made in few and simple words. The verses which follow (2–6) tell the story. God has tested the Psalmist's heart, as he wandered through the world playing his part in its changing scenes. And the Psalmist has stood the test with happy result. God (in Hebrew phrase) has "known" him; He has made him one of His acquaintance, almost a "friend" (John xv. 15).

Here we meet a special form of the phenomenon which some style "the Self-righteousness of the Psalmists." The phrase is not a happy one. When a Psalmist asserts his innocence or his righteousness it is more often than not in relation to the justice or righteousness of God. The Psalmist is not merely self-related. If he asserts, "I was also perfect with [my God]," it is in order that he may confess to JEHOVAH, "With the perfect man Thou will shew Thyself perfect" (xviii. 25). The righteous judgment of God is uppermost in his mind, as when he triumphantly exclaims, "The Lord rewarded me according to my righteousness" (xviii. 20). The Psalmists (like Bishop Butler) are interested in the fact that "virtue, *as such*, is actually rewarded, and vice, *as such*, punished"[1] by the Divine Ruler of the world.

In Psalm cxxxix. 2–6 the theme is the ample reward given

[1] *Analogy*, Part I., ch. iii.

by JEHOVAH to the man whom He has searched through and through and found faithful to Himself. Not even Psalm xxiii. contains a more vivid story of God's lovingkindness to one whom He had approved.

JEHOVAH'S CARE OF THE WANDERER AT EVERY TURN.

Thou, even Thou, didst know my sitting down and my
rising up :
From afar Thou didst perceive my thought.
My path and my lair Thou didst winnow :
And all my ways Thou didst dispose.
Though there was no word on my tongue,
Yet Thou, JEHOVAH, didst know all my way.
Thou didst beset me behind and before,
And lay Thy covering hand over me.
Thy knowledge is too wonderful for me,
I cannot attain unto it. (Vers. 2–6.)

It was no ordinary journey that the wanderer pursued : he was in hiding (it seems) from his enemies : he did not know where he would find rest by the way, nor when he would have to rise again to continue his flight ; but JEHOVAH knew his changing resolves, for JEHOVAH discovered his path and tracked him to his couch in the wilderness. He had no need to give voice to his wants ; God knew them already. That hidden couch in the jungle was no better than a wild beast's lair, but it was known to God. As the Psalmist went his solitary way he became conscious that JEHOVAH was both before him and behind to guard him, and that the Divine hand was covering him.

"While an Arm ran across
Which the earth heaved beneath like a breast
Where the wretch was safe prest ! "
(R. Browning, *Instans Tyrannus.*)

The revelation of this constant Divine providence was too

much for the Psalmist; the thought of it overpowered him. How minute and sympathetic a knowledge it betokened on the part of JEHOVAH! Boundless indeed is God's care of the man whom He approves.

But as the Psalmist contemplates JEHOVAH'S omnipresent care, he recollects that it is by His Spirit, penetrating everywhere like the wind and like the wind unseen, that God acts upon men. ("Wind" and "spirit" are the same word in Hebrew.) God's activity reaches to every place, because He is in every place. The Psalmist is awe-stricken by this constant Presence, and at the same time re-assured by it. Daringly (for his age) he writes that even if he lay down in Sheol, he would not get away from God. The author of Psalm lxxxviii. [5] may write, "Cast off among the dead . . . who . . . are cut away from Thy hand," but our Psalmist counters this cry of despair with the simple confession of faith, "If I strew my bed in Sheol, behold, Thou art there." Again, Jonah might take a ship of Tarshish (Tartessus) to flee towards the sun-setting "from the presence of JEHOVAH," but the Psalmist knows that it is useless to flee even as swiftly as the Dawn—useless to hide even in the (fabled) darkness of the West. Probably the Psalmist had fled that way, but even in that far country his God had taken him by the hand, and guided the man who fled from Him.

THE USELESSNESS OF FLIGHT FROM THE OMNIPRESENT SPIRIT.

Whither shall I go from Thy spirit?
And whither shall I flee from Thy presence?
If I go up to heaven, there Thou art;
And if I strew my bed in Sheol, behold Thou art there.
If I lift up the wings of the Dawn,
If I alight in the uttermost part of the West,

There also shall thy hand guide me,
And Thy right hand shall take hold of me.
And if I say, Surely darkness will overwhelm me,
And the light will become night about me,
Even darkness darkeneth not from Thee,
But the night shineth as the day:
As is the darkness so is the light. (Vers. 7–12.)

Indeed, why should darkness hide a man from God? The Psalmist remembers in the verses that follow (13–16) that God forms man in the dark, and watches over the beginnings of his life in the dark. The mother's body by God's providence sheltered the unborn Psalmist from all dangers. A set number of days was appointed, and his birth did not come until all were fulfilled. When the infant awoke at last to the light of this world, it was to find JEHOVAH'S care still over him.

It is to be observed that the parallelism in verse 13 marks a progress. The second member is not a mere echo of the first, as the rendering "Thou hast knit me together" (R.V. marg.) would make it. JEHOVAH first creates, and then protects the unborn child. So in verse 1 JEHOVAH first searches the Psalmist within, and then approves him. Similarly in verse 3 the Psalmist is first trackt down, and then JEHOVAH undertakes to direct his ways. The frequent tendency of commentators to treat the second member of a parallel couplet as a vain repetition is to be resisted.

GOD'S CARE IN THE MAKING OF MAN.

For Thou didst form my inward parts:
Thou didst shelter me with my mother's womb.
I will thank Thee, for Thou didst deal fearfully and wonderfully with me [1];

[1] Lit., "I was dealt with. . . ."

Wonderful are Thy works;
Yea, my soul shall acknowledge them.
My frame was not hidden from Thee,
When I was made in the secret place,
When I was curiously wrought, as it were beneath the earth.
Thine eyes did see my substance;
And in Thy book were they all written,
Even the days which were created,
And not one of them [tarried].
How precious unto me are Thy thoughts, O God!
How great is the sum of them!
If I count them, they are more in number than the sand:
I awoke from my sleep[1] to be still present with Thee.
(Vers. 13–18.)

The course of the psalm changes: the author turns abruptly from wondering praise to urgent petition. In the change itself there is nothing surprising: it is a common spiritual phenomenon: a creature as dependent as man can hardly address any words to God without becoming conscious as he proceeds of the urgency of his own wants. So even so fervent an outpouring of praise as Psalm xl. ends in an urgent petition for God's help.[2]

The earlier verses of Psalm cxxxix. imply that the Psalmist has been in hiding from his enemies. In verse 3 he speaks of his forest "lair," in verse 5 of the "covering hand" of God. When he asks in verse 7, "Whither shall I flee from Thy spirit?" the language is probably suggested by his actual flight from his enemies. And so while his praise for past deliverance is exceptionally fervent, it is not surprising

[1] In the womb.

[2] The unity of Ps. xl. also has been called in question, *e.g.*, by Cheyne and Duhm. I have replied to them in *Lex in Corde* (1910), pp. 109–111.

that he should petition with equal vehemence for the help which he needs in the present. Nay, the very sense he has of the greatness of God's care over him in bygone days leads him to pray more earnestly now. His enemies are very near at hand. His thought in verse 18 was that God had been with him from his mother's womb; his present thought (from verse 19 onward) is that now "men of blood" are closing round him. He is in jeopardy every hour. Thus the transition in the psalm is abrupt in word only; psychologically there is no break.

THE PSALMIST'S ENEMIES, THE ENEMIES OF GOD.

Oh that Thou wouldst slay the wicked one, O God:
Yea, depart from me, ye men of blood.
For they rebel against Thee, plotting wickedly,[1]
And Thine enemies take up Thy name in vain.
Do I not hate them, O JEHOVAH, who hate Thee?
And abhor those who rise up against Thee?
With complete hatred I have hated them;
They are become my enemies, even mine. (Vers. 19–22.)

The "men of blood" against whom the Psalmist prays are evidently not heathens, but unfaithful Israelites. They make use of the name of JEHOVAH, but insincerely. They have an end in view which is not that of the Psalmist; perhaps it is to get the law of Moses relaxt. The Psalmist meets his unfaithful co-religionists with a declaration of war. He gives them up as false to his God: he proceeds to reckon them among his personal enemies.

A LAST PETITION.

Search me, O God, and approve my heart;
Test me, and approve my thoughts.

[1] "Who utter Thy name with wicked thought" (Jewish Version, Philadelphia, 1917).

And see if there be any grievous way in me,
And lead me in the way everlasting. (Vers. 23, 24.)

The Psalmist has declared already that he has been searched and approved by JEHOVAH (ver. 1). But his conviction of his own innocence is not strong enough to give him perfect confidence when he perceives an active enemy near at hand. He yearns once more to experience that feeling of acceptance with JEHOVAH which dictated the opening words of the psalm. He is no longer content to ask for deliverance from his present troubles : the uncertain future drives him to put up a petition for permanent safety : " Lead me," he prays, " in an everlasting way " (*ἐν ὁδῷ αἰωνίᾳ*, LXX).

It remains to examine some of the strange expressions found in this psalm. In verse 3 occurs the vivid phrase, " Thou winnowest my path and my lair." The literal sense of the verb " winnow " need not be questioned : it is found (in Qal) in Isaiah xxx. 24 ; Ruth iii. 2 ; *al.* Here in a metaphorical sense it means to " search out, examine thoroughly.' The eye of God follows the difficult path through the jungle until it reaches the bed of grass and leaves on which the fugitive sleeps in hiding. The Psalmist's " lying down " is as the wild beast lies down, רבע being the Aramaic form of רבץ. In verse 4, " all my way Thou didst dispose " (*hiskanta*), JEHOVAH is regarded as acting as the steward, *dispensator*, (Heb. *sōkēn*) of all the Psalmist's activities.

In verse 8, " if I strew my bed in Sheol," the reference is clearly to lying in the grave : cp. Isaiah xiv. 11, " the worm is strewn under thee " (with the same verb in Hebrew). The idea of the presence of the spirit of God in Sheol is startling, but perhaps the Psalmist means no more than Job xxvi. 6, " Sheol is naked before Him, and Abaddon hath no covering."

The phrase, "Thou didst shelter me with my mother's womb" (ver. 13), is noteworthy. The Psalmist thinks of himself not merely as hidden, but also as protected: so Briggs. Moderns, followed in R.V. marg., usually give "weave" or "knit together" in this passage, but the common meaning of the root סכך is "cover" or "screen."

The last words of verse 16 are very difficult: Jerome (*Psalterium iuxta Hebraeos*) gives a literal translation of the C'thib, *et non* [*est*] *una* (i.e. *dies*) *in eis*. I suggest that a verb (not the substantive verb) has fallen out, thus: ולא אחר אחד בהם, "and not one of them tarried," i.e., not one of the days tarried, i.e. failed. All were accomplisht, and the child was duly (not prematurely) born. Of the K'ri (ולו for ולא) I can give no account: the Versions seem to have read a negative.

In verse 18 the word "I awoke" could by itself be taken in the sense of awaking out of the sleep of death (so Briggs), but in the present context it is more probable that it refers to the infant's awakening to consciousness at birth.

In verse 20 the rendering, "they rebel against thee," is taken from the C'thib ימרוך (consonantal text): a good parallel is found in the ימרוהו, "they rebelled against him"; cf. Psalm lxxviii. 40. On the other hand the K'ri יִמְרוּךְ may be paralleled from תמרו (2 Sam. xix. 14). Six of Ginsburg's MSS. actually read יאמרוך, "utter Thy name" (R.V. marg.).

W. Emery Barnes.

THE HELLENISTIC WORLD BEHIND THE NEW TESTAMENT.[1]

It was a popular article of belief among Christian people until quite recent times that the Christian religion in its original form was an entirely new phenomenon, standing in absolute antithesis to the world upon which it dawned, and that it proceeded out of the hand of God complete and fully armed, as Pallas Athene is said to have issued from the head of Zeus, showing no marks of the influence of the world around it, save of that which sprang from its connexion with Judaism. According to this view there did not exist in the pre-Christian world, if we except the Jewish section of it, anything that was "true, honest, just, pure, lovely, or of good report" (Phil. iv. 8), in spite of St. Paul's explicit assertion to the contrary, and paganism as a whole was credited with little beyond its darkness, its immorality, and its misery. It was no uncommon thing to find all that was most corrupt and degrading in paganism set against the noblest products of Christianity, and monsters like Nero and Caligula were frequently contrasted with saints like St. Peter and St. John. We have now, however, come to realise that it was the same God who ruled the world before and after the dawn of Christianity, and that the depreciation of paganism is not necessarily the best means of enhancing the glory of the religion of Christ. And further, a truer view of the essential *oneness* of religion has been teaching us that Christianity, like every institution that bears a fundamental relation to mankind, is indebted to history and evolution for many of its elements and that it bears clear marks of the age in which it was born. And this we have

[1] A paper read before the Reading Branch of the Central Society of Sacred Study, June 10, 1920.

learnt without in any way surrendering our belief in the originality of what makes Christianity the unique and absolute religion in the world. At the same time we must not allow our appreciation of what the ancient world contributed to the formation of Christianity to lead us to the other extreme and bring us to look upon Christianity as merely the product of its environment. Christianity is not a medley of Jewish, Greek, Roman, and Oriental ideas deftly combined to form a new religion, as many modern scholars would have us believe, although there is doubtless some element of truth in the conception, seeing that it was God who prepared the soil for the planting of the new religion and created a world ready and longing for its acceptance. It is a grave misconception to regard Christianity as merely the simple and natural product of a moral and spiritual development. What gave it significance, what endowed it with matchless power and force, was that it brought into the world a new spirit and a new life. The mystery of Christianity consisted in "the appearing of our Saviour, Jesus Christ, who hath abolished death and hath brought life and immortality to light through the Gospel" (2 Tim. i. 10).

I propose in this paper to give a general outline of this world to which Christianity made its primary appeal, in its social, political, and religious aspects, pointing out the elements and influences which were to operate upon nascent Christianity, so that we may be able to comprehend the directions and the degree in which the new religion was indebted to the world into which it was born.

The Hellenistic World.

Every age in the world's history has its sign manual, and "The Hellenistic World" is the most appropriate and illuminating description of the age which witnessed the coming of Christianity. The Greek spirit in its widest

adaptation was the most characteristic and the most potent influence operating within it. It is a world which has received but scant justice in literature until quite within our own time. The studies that were devoted to the period were principally concerned with its relation to classical learning and the elucidation of classical texts, and it is only within our own generation that its importance in the history of culture and religion has begun to be recognised. The increasing interest manifested in its history is largely due to our possession of fresh information which has thrown a flood of light upon some of its essential features and made clear much of what was before wrapped in dense obscurity. Modern excavation and archæology have rescued from a world of oblivion materials in abundance in the shape of inscriptions, papyri, and ostraka which help to make the Hellenistic age as intelligible and as real to the student as almost any period since the dawn of history, and we have come to learn that in some aspects it is of greater importance in the history of intellectual, social, and religious progress than the great classical period which preceded it. It is in our study of the Hellenistic world that we see how the two broad streams of influences which have contributed most to the creation of what is best and noblest in the life of to-day, viz. Greek thought and the Christian religion, met, first of all as relatively hostile forces in vigorous conflict for the supremacy, and afterwards coalescing and forming an alliance which proved irresistible, with the strange result that it was the Christian Church that preserved for future generations much of what was most precious in the heritage of Greece. It was then that the language, the culture, and the civilisation of Athens, hitherto the monopoly of a small aristocratic group, were thrown into the welter of nations and became a leaven working through the whole mass of a newly created world. The language of Attic Greece aban-

doned its lofty height of isolation and condescended to a lower and more popular level, and although in the process it inevitably lost much of its perfection and purity of form, its condescension proved to be the blessing of the world. Greek philosophy, once the treasured possession of the few, became the heritage of the many, assuming a character that was often commonplace and closely related to popular beliefs, but it was this transformation alone that enabled Greek thought to become a world-power and to assume a place in the world's history that it never would have attained had it persevered in its aristocratic isolation. It was by this process that it became the spirit dominating the world washed by the Mediterranean and the driving force which justifies us in designating that world as Hellenistic in its essential character.

It was a world in many respects akin to the world of our own day. Like our own it was a world of free enquiry and criticism. No subject was too sacred for discussion, no dogma too authoritative to be questioned, and every problem that agitates our minds to-day, the being of God, His relation to man, human fate, sociological principles, international relations, political ideals, rights of property, morality and religion, was freely canvassed in an atmosphere that was remarkably tolerant and open-minded. It was also a scientific world as far as science was understood in that age, and intellect and reason were accorded a place of honour in the scheme of human life. It was a world rich in its expression of life in all its departments, and pre-eminently a world of new enthusiasms and new religions. In its higher circles there prevailed a deep contempt for the traditional religions of the past, which produced a wide gap between the beliefs of the cultured few and the popular religions of the many. In language, facilities of communication, and in general culture it was a united world.

The Conquests of Alexander.

The event which ushered in the dawn of this Hellenistic and world-transforming movement was primarily an event of the political order, viz. the conquests of Alexander and the rise of the Greek Empire. It was the sword of this warrior that opened the way for the dominance of the ideals of his country. It is possible that Alexander was as anxious to extend the culture of the Greek as he was to enlarge the borders of his realm, for it is clear that he was a dreamer as well as a conqueror. He is said to have invariably slept with a copy of the Iliad under his pillow, and the fact that he and more than a hundred of his chief officers married Persian wives in February 324 B.C. shows that he also "saw visions and dreamed dreams." His purpose was to wed the East to the West, and that not merely by a process of conquest, but by the resources of peace and social life, and even among the glories of Alexander's brilliant career nothing redounds more to his credit than the adoption of this policy.

Universalism and Individualism.

The most important result in the world of religion and culture which followed the victorious progress of Alexander was the rise of two new ideals, universalism and individualism, and, as we shall see later, much of what was most significant in the achievements of that age and of what gave the Hellenistic world its importance in the history of development was due to the action of these new forces. The opening up of the East had a twofold effect and involved not only the Hellenising of the East but also the Orientalising of the West. And in some sense it is this which is the most salient characteristic of the Hellenistic world in the earlier period of its history, seeing that it formed the meeting-place of two powerful forces, the one from the West and the other

from the East, which although they eventually coalesced, still enable us to discern the separate currents in the wide ocean of life and culture to which they conjointly contributed. It is not quite accurate to describe the Hellenistic movement as being exclusively dominated by Hellenic influence, because in some respects the Eastern stream proved to be the mightier of the two, and this is particularly true of the sphere of religion. If Greek thought, the Greek tongue, and Greek political ideals prevailed in the Hellenistic world, it was the *religions* of the East that mainly guided the destinies of that age. The movement towards political and social universalism began on Greek soil when Philip of Macedon and Alexander converted a number of individuual " city states " into a united nation and so created a power capable of developing into a world-wide Empire. A united language also emerged from the breaking down of dialectical differences, and on the basis of Attic there was developed a world-language which rendered the wide diffusion of Greek thought and culture a fairly easy accomplishment. The movement was then extended across the Ægean into Asia Minor, where great military colonies were founded, and from Asia Minor into the far Eastern countries, so that the whole of the Orient became in a sense a Greek world. The establishment of Alexander's Empire was not without its reflex action upon the Greek himself, for it developed in him a breadth and toleration to which he had hitherto been a comparative stranger. Contact with civilisations older and in some aspects more advanced than his own created in him a respect for a world which he had stigmatised as barbarous, and familiarity with new ideas produced that wider outlook and more cosmopolitan spirit which are discernible in the Greek philosophers, historians, and poets of that age.

By the removal of national and tribal barriers man be-

came a citizen of the world and not the mere subject of a single city or state, and thus there was fostered the idea of humanity as a whole in relative independence of civic or national limitations. This universalising of the Greek mind and spirit was again met by a corresponding movement from the East, and, in this instance, mainly on the side of religion. The old religions of Assyria, Babylon, and Persia had coalesced to a substantial degree centuries before the conquests of Alexander, but a new impulse was given to the movement by the establishment of the Greek Empire and its subsequent partition. The religions of Egypt and Syria now lost their local character, the old national gods abandoned their local names, and religion as a whole tended to become universal and syncretistic. Eastern religions on their march westwards took on Greek forms and Greek names, while retaining their original character, and the Greek in turn began to show an intelligent interest in the primitive cults and religions of the world that he had conquered. Berosus, the Babylonian historian, revealed to him the treasures contained in the religions of Assyria and Babylon, while Manetho performed an equally valuable service for him with reference to the religion of Egypt. But it is the Septuagint translation of the Hebrew Scriptures that affords the most striking proof of the Greek interest in Eastern religion and literature, and it is probable that this was more effective in developing the universalistic movement than any other influence in the Hellenistic world in the pre-Christian period.

Individualism.

The trend of events which produced the universalistic movement was equally successful in developing the complementary idea of individualism. The old Greek conception of the State as the one essential unit to which all personal

needs and aspirations should be subordinated effectually prevented the growth of the idea of human dignity and the worth of personality, while it at the same time hindered human intercourse and destroyed the sense of a common intellectual and political ideal. But when Philip of Macedon and his greater son freed Greece from the incubus of the "city states" they also freed the individual from the bondage in which these had held him, immeasurably enlarged his horizon, and for the first time in Greek history gave him the opportunity of realising his value and place as a free personal entity and as a citizen of the world. Private societies and voluntary associations now took the place formerly occupied by the State, the life of the home and family assumed an importance hitherto denied to them, and woman attained to a prominence that was unknown in the ancient world.

Individualism also received a substantial stimulus from the side of religion. In Greece the rationalistic spirit had deprived the old gods of polytheism of all religious significance, and the spread of knowledge and contact with new culture and civilisations had destroyed the validity of the old traditional views and had created a feeling of the uncertainty and relativity of all values and so encouraged the growth of individual free-will and selection. All national bonds and limitations were loosened by this process of disintegration, and the world for a time became a ceaseless ferment of nations and religions which offered a rare opportunity for the development of individual consciousness and responsibility. And further, the bond between the worshipper and his god was no longer a question of locality or nation, but a purely personal relation. The old local and national gods of the Eastern religions became world-gods, and in every instance the god was the saviour of the individual. The personal need of that individual, his immortal

soul, the man himself, were now the engrossing problem of every god and of every religious cult.

Philosophy in the Greek world.

The most adequate expression of philosophic thought in the Hellenistic world was to be found in Stoicism, and that because it united in a remarkable way the ruling factors in Greek mentality and the religiosity of the Eastern character. Stoicism was in its origin of Eastern stock, and most of the older Stoics came from the East, where nations were mixed and civilisations interchangeable. Bishop Lightfoot describes Stoicism as the earliest offspring of the union between the religious consciousness of the East and the intellectual culture of the West, and attributes much of what distinguishes it from other schools of philosophy, its intense moral earnestness, its emphasis upon conscience, its prophetic spirit to its Eastern affinities. It was permeated by the growing spirit of universalism to a greater extent than any other philosophical system. The world was its "State," and man, as such, its "citizen." Virtue alone was its title to freedom, and in its teaching it transcended all boundaries and limitations, whether of nationality, race, family, or religious ties. It possessed neither temples nor images, and its felllowship was based entirely on moral values and similarity of moral interests. Its ideals included the universal fatherhood of God, a fundamental cosmopolitanism, the reconciliation of mankind, and the divine law established in the heart of man. Individualism was also given its due place in Stoicism, and indeed in all the contemporary schools of philosophy. The ideal of the "wise man" personified by Stoic, Epicurean, and Sceptic alike infallibly led to the enhancement of the individual consciousness. The "wise man" of the Stoic stood on a divine-like height, untouched by outward relations such as

the love or hate of man or the worst blows of fate, and dwelt in indestructible serenity, the citizen of another world. The Epicurean with his doctrine that pleasure is the highest law and that the state, religion, art, and poetry should consequently be ignored, tended, however, to bring individualism to contempt. *Ἐκλυτέον ἑαυτούς ἐκ τοῦ περὶ ἐγκύκλια καὶ πολιτικὰ δεσπωτηρίου*, says Epicurus, founder of the School. "The world and its affairs are merely a prison-house, therefore free yourselves from it and from all political and social fetters."

Philosophy becomes religious.

A further effect of the contact of Greek thought with Eastern religiosity was that philosophy itself was becoming religious. Philosophy was now not a mere intellectual system, but led man to look to the heart and aimed at his freedom from the world and its allurements, the purification of his soul by the mastery of the passions, and taught him that purity was the highest ornament of his life. Stoicism from its earliest days was religious in its outlook, as might be expected from its Eastern origin, but it was too artificial in character to become a real religious force. In its later days, as represented by Poseidonius of Apamea, a definite attempt was made to remove this weakness. Eastern mysticism, cosmology, and even Babylonian astrology were introduced into the body of contemporary Stoicism, which in the hands of Poseidonius, who combined in his own person the Oriental principle of an inseparable connexion between God and man with the noblest conceptions of Greek thought, became a philosophical doctrine of redemption. The same blend of philosophy and popular Eastern beliefs was characteristic of the newer schools, as e.g. the Neo-Pythagorean, which was an amalgam of Greek thought and Oriental magic, and the Neo-Platonic, in which a purely

Oriental form of ecstasy became the aim and climax of the philosophic life. The trend of philosophy as a whole at this period was towards monotheism, and in this respect it rendered valuable service by keeping religion on the right path and by destroying the popular belief in polytheism.

One practical result of the tendency of philosophy to become religious was that it assumed a missionary character and strove to become popular. The most noted pioneers of this philosophic propaganda were the Cynic-Stoic wandering preachers, who were to be met in the squares and open spaces of the great cities of the Hellenistic world, bringing philosophy within range of the masses. Their teaching was marked by a vigorous polemic against polytheism, a deep moral earnestness, a real effort to effect a moral reformation by the inculcation of a purer religion, a more refined morality, and a deeper sense of individual responsibility. The noblest monument to the excellence of this is contained in the lectures of Epictetus, the lame Stoic slave, which are still extant.

Religion in the Hellenistic World.

A weightier force than philosophy and exercising a far wider sway over the Hellenistic world was the power of religion. The abundance of fresh material for the study of this period has established the significant fact that this world was essentially a religious world, a world dominated by a religious current, to which many diverse religious streams contributed their share.

(a) *The Religion of Greece.*

The philosophers and poets of the classical period, and Plato and Euripides in particular, had already done much to dethrone the ancient religion of Greece, with its Olympus and the many gods so dramatically pictured by Homer and

Hesiod, but its life was prolonged because it was adopted by the "city State" in the fifth and fourth centuries B.C. and converted into a political entity in which the faith of the individual was entirely subordinated to the interests of the community. Religion, in theory, held a high place in the thoughts of the best of Greek philosophers, but in every case, and this is true even of Plato, it remained completely separated from practical life, and it never exerted that influence upon the daily life of the masses which is essential if religion is to be progressive. Stoicism made a brave attempt to break down the limitations imposed by the State religion and to develop the idea that humanity was a corporate unity and that every individual was worthy of honour as such. But although it possessed much that was of real moral and religious value, an exalted conception of the being of God and of His relation to man, a wide view of the brotherhood of man, a deeply penetrating moral earnestness, it also, like its predecessors in Greece, failed to satisfy the needs of the masses. In spite of its sympathetic attitude towards humanity as a whole it remained too abstract and mechanical in its nature to give form and substance to religion. It was lacking in those very qualities which arouse the enthusiasm of the ordinary man. It made no claim to a special revelation, and it had no mystical ritual wherewith to express and intensify the beliefs of a religious community. The outstanding mood of the period in Greece and elsewhere was the burning consciousness of an estrangement between God and man, and it is in the attempt to bridge the gap between the two that the real significance of the Hellenistic religion is to be found. On Greek soil the longing for union and reconciliation with God found expression in the renewal of the old Greek Mysteries which now sprang into new life and vigour. It was in these, and not in the religion of the philosopher, that the common herd, the poor and needy, the

woman and the slave discovered a medium by which they directly attained to a profound and personal relation with God. Of these the most noted were the Eleusinian, Orphic, and Dionysiac Mysteries. Although they were separated from each other by considerable differences of detail, the fundamental principles underlying the Mysteries were identical. The dominant idea in every cult was that communion with God was within reach of every man by means of some particular ritual act and ceremony, and that the worshipper came to partake of the nature of his own particular god. In the orgiastic cult of the Thracian Dionysus the main feature was the ecstasy or enthusiasm manifested in wild revels by torchlight on the mountain side, accompanied by the tumultuous music of flutes, cymbals and tambourines, and frenzied dances, all testifying to the presence of the god. The devotees felt that they were *ἐνθουσιασμένοι*, *ἔνθεοι* in the literal sense of the terms, that they were caught up into actual contact with the deity and filled with his spirit. It was a cult which appealed preeminently to women, and Euripides has left us a living picture of this aspect of Dionysiac worship in the *Bacchae*.

The other two systems, and Orphism in particular, contained elements of a higher moral and spiritual value than the cult of Dionysus. In the Orphic Mysteries union with the divine was attained through self-restraint and a strictly ordered life leading to purity, which was symbolised by the wearing of white robes. The sense of brotherhood was encouraged and this fostered the formation of social communities, the *θίασοι*, while the high moral aspirations of the members was illustrated by their claim to be *ὅσιοι*. All through the cult there was felt the burning desire for self-surrender and mystic union with a being who could deliver from the evils of the present world and assure a blessed immortality in the world beyond.

(b) *The Oriental Religions in the Hellenistic World.*

It is from the East that the tide of religion has flowed in every age, and it was in the East that the ruling spirit in Hellenistic religion originated. This religion was in essence a syncretism of Greek and Oriental elements in which the language and philosophic ideas were Greek, while the truly religious conceptions were an inheritance from far distant epochs of Eastern religious history. From Egypt came the cults of Serapis and Isis, from Phrygia the cult of Cybele and Attis, from Syria that of Adonis, and from Persia the worship of Mithras, which in later days penetrated to the furthest limits of the Roman Empire and became the strongest rival of Christianity in the declining days of paganism. When they reached the Græco-Roman world these alien worships had already lost much of their original purity and isolation and had undergone a substantial blending, and the syncretistic process was completed on their victorious march westwards by the adoption of Greek names for the various gods, so creating a type of religion which was Greek in language and terminology, but Oriental in its principles and genius. Every cult was filled with an intense desire to extend its dominion and to become a world-religion, and in its efforts to adapt itself to new surroundings became denationalised, universal, and individualistic. If we regard the Hellenistic religion as one great whole it gives us the impression of an entity consisting of a medley of new forms created by the combination of diverse elements cemented together by cosmological and theological speculations and yet forming a kind of unity in that its *weltanschauung* is on the whole a homogeneous one. Our knowledge of the pre-Christian history of these cults is very scanty, but recent discoveries in the shape of inscriptions and of magical papyri unearthed in Egypt throw considerable light upon their later developments, and the informa-

tion at our disposal enables us to distinguish certain fundamental features which were common ground to all the cults.

1. In every cult *God was brought near to man* and was no longer the transcendent, inaccessible being of Greek philosophy. Osiris, Attis, and Adonis were divine beings who became men, who died and rose again as gods, and Mithras is the mediator between God and man.

2. Every cult was *a religion of redemption.* The ancient world lived in never-ceasing consciousness of the domination of evil spirits, whether conceived as Ἀνάγκη or Εἱμαρμένη by the Greek or as astral gods by the Oriental, and religion meant deliverance from the power and tyranny of these hostile beings. There was also inherent in the thought of all the Mysteries the prospect they offered of victory over death and of an eternal blessedness in the world beyond.

3. Redemption was to be accomplished *by union with the deity* regarded as a power transcending the might and dominion of fate or of the astral gods and lifting the worshipper above the hopeless round of necessity and beyond the world controlled by the spirits of the air. This union with the deity was consummated in the Oriental Mysteries, as in those of Greece, by an elaborate ritual and process, of which we have the clearest expression in Apuleius' description of the initiation of Lucius into the Mystery of Isis at Cenchreæ, where purification, re-birth, and special revelations follow one upon the other, until the climax is reached in the overpowering vision of the goddess herself and the final identification of the mystic with the deity. The Mystery Religion beyond all doubt met a widely-felt need. Its aim was an exalted one, the raising of the soul above the transiency of perishable matter to an immortal life through union with the divine. Its very symbolism was pregnant with new hope for sin-stricken and soul-striving mortals. Its rites

and sacraments, its lustrations and sacred meals, were an ever-present encouragement to the worshipper who saw in them an earnest of the actual union with the god which was to be his.

The principal weakness of the Mystery Religions consisted in the fact that their redeemer-gods and mediators of salvation were still too closely associated with the old pagan naturalism and its ecstatic orgiasm to satisfy and permanently to hold the more finely touched spirits and the more rational minds. But they seem to have possessed a wonderful attraction for the crowd, and this is probably to be attributed to the strenuous efforts made to arouse enthusiasm by means of elaborate ritual displays and to the unceasing appeal to the heart rather than to the mind of man. It was an additional weakness that there was no essential connexion between the expiatory rites and an ethical ideal. There were thousands of pious souls among the devotees of Isis and Mithras, but their religion consisted in little more than a correct and regular participation in the ceremonies of the cult. In a word, the Mystery cults were strong on the religious side, but often deplorably deficient in morality.

(c) *Emperor Worship.*

In contrast to the endless variety and individualistic character of the Oriental Religions there was one religious system in the Hellenistic world which stood for unity and universality, viz. the worship of the Roman Emperor. The worship of the sovereign ruler was familiar in Babylon and Egypt centuries before, and something approaching it was current in Greece in olden days when heroic men were after death elevated to be gods. But it was the marvellous personality and career of Alexander that gave the strongest stimulus to the movement, and both he and his successors

in Syria and Egypt became the recipients of divine honours and were officially designated θεοί. It was in the East too that the movement which led to the apotheosis of the Emperor had its beginning. In the declining days of the Republic temples were erected in Asia to the Roman proconsuls and generals, and it was in Asia that the official cult of the Emperor was first recognised. Emperor-worship was natural enough in the Asiatic who delighted in adulation, but it was primarily a recognition of the benefits which the Roman provincial received from the Imperial government. The *pax Romana* brought to a world desolated by war and disorder a sense of justice, security, and plenty which it had never experienced before. Tyranny and injustice were banished, communication and traffic became safe and rapid, resources were immeasurably multiplied, and the golden age seemed to have arrived. The Emperor, as the representative of the power which bestowed such blessings, was by the Eastern imagination easily invested with divine prerogatives, and his apotheosis developed with considerable rapidity throughout the Empire. It must also be borne in mind that it was not only in Jewish circles that the hope of a "Messiah" was cherished. The noblest literature of Rome, and more especially the Fourth Eclogue of Virgil and the Odes of Horace, are full of the Messianic idea. The birth of the Empire and the reign of Augustus were widely heralded as the dawn of the new age. They brought peace and happiness to a world sick and wearied of bloodshed and slaughter, law and justice to replace tyranny and disorder, and so created the vision of a world where truth and purity might reign supreme. The wide prevalence of the title "Saviour" attached to the names of successive Emperors on the inscriptions of the period admirably illustrates the special character that the sovereign assumed in the mind of the Roman provincial. From the Imperila side the move-

ment was encouraged because it provided what the Empire lacked most, a bond of unity and an incitement to loyalty. Supported by Augustus and developed by later Emperors it soon became the official State religion, and was ultimately enforced by the whole weight of the Imperial power. And yet it never became a purely religious force in the Hellenistic world, and it remained a political rather than a religious system. It made no attempt to displace the other religions, and the freest toleration was accorded to them all with one significant exception. The worshipper of Attis and Osiris never regarded himself as unfaithful to his own cult when he paid homage to the image of the Emperor, and the Jew was given the special privilege of refraining from Emperor-worship. Christianity was the only religion that was persecuted by the Roman power, and that because it definitely refused to set the Emperor side by side with Christ the Saviour.

(d) *Judaism.*

Of all the religious forces operating in the Hellenistic world Judaism was the most significant and the most effective. It was no longer the religion of a small and confined nation as we know it in the old Testament, but was now a power of world-wide historical importance. The Jew had penetrated into every corner of the Empire and commanded universal attention, occasionally of a favourable character, but generally marked by an intense hostility to his particular claims and tenets. Strabo describes the Jew as " penetrating into all the States so that it is difficult to find a place in the whole world where this race has not obtained a footing and is not ruled by it." Although Judaism in the Hellenistic age was divided into two well-defined sections, the Judaism of Palestine and the Diaspora, it still remained a strongly cemented spiritual unity, which,

in spite of the fact that it had overflowed the Græco-Roman world still had its centre and home in a small corner of that world, in Jerusalem. And further, it was this small and narrow centre that provided it with most of what was essential in its character and separated it from every other religious rival. The other religions of the East had loosened themselves from all national ties and associations in order to become world-religions, and, although Judaism desired as strongly as they did to win the world for itself, its efforts in this direction were nullified to a considerable extent by national and racial limitations. It was the connection with Jerusalem and all that was implied in that connexion that explain the comparative failure of Judaism as a missionary organisation. When a Greek or Roman became a convert of Attis or Isis this had no effect upon his standing as a citizen or a man, but if he adopted Judaism he must perforce become a Jew himself. All the ideas of toleration and freedom nourished in the Jew of the Diaspora by contact with the great world were of no avail against the one predominant principle of Judaism that the Jewish religion and Jewish national claims, usages, and customs were inseparable. The best minds of the pagan world respected and admired the monotheism of the Jew, his high standard of morality, and his inspired Scriptures, but his exclusiveness and his determination to remain an alien and a separate unit in a world where all such claims and limitations were being rapidly dissolved inevitably repelled and created hostility. It is this that explains the hatred and contempt of practically every contemporary secular writer for the Hellenistic Jew and his religion. Satirists like Juvenal, moralists like Cicero and Seneca, historians like Tacitus all contribute to the volume of adverse criticism of the Jew which is one of the most characteristic notes of the age.

It is no slight tribute to its spiritual and religious power

that Judaism, in spite of the hostility of the secular world, was able to attract and bring within its borders a multitude of adherents, who, in varying degrees, subjected themselves to its peculiar customs and usages. The Judaistic "God-fearer" was in some respects the noblest religious product of that age and paved the way for the advance of Christianity more effectively than any other religious type. Judaism as a whole, however, never freed itself sufficiently from national bonds to enable it to become a religion of humanity, but what Judaism failed to do was accomplished by the religion of Christ, which was hampered by no national claims or recollections. The relative success accorded to the missionary activity of Judaism was due to its possession of elements which were in some cases in advance of and in others in complete accord with the best sentiments of the age. The teaching of later Greek philosophy had already prepared the way for the acceptance of its typical doctrine of monotheism, while its conception of the unity and goodness of God was in advance of what was taught by any contemporaneous religious system and made a powerful appeal to all that was best in the Hellenistic world. The general moral and religious outlook of the Jew made him a valuable ally to the Stoic and Cynic teachers in their protest against the anthropomorphism and polytheism of the earlier Greek religions. In spite of the failure of Judaism to win the Hellenistic world for itself, and this was due to the presence within it of elements which constituted its very soul, it still remained the highest and the most spiritual religious force in that world until Christianity came to take its place.

This then in its more salient features was the world upon which Christianity dawned, and we are now in a position to realise the significance of St. Paul's declaration that Christ came "in the fulness of time." It was a variegated and

many-coloured world and yet characterised by a very remarkable unity. On the one hand there were principles operating which were demolishing the barriers that separated nation from nation, language from language, religion from religion, and were thus producing a homogeneous world. On the other hand these identical principles were teaching man to cherish and value his rights and responsibilities as the individual, quite apart from any outward relationships. It was a world permeated through and through by religiosity, if not by religion at its best. It was a world where the burden of sin and of human misery was intensely realised, and at no period of his history did man express more clearly his need of redemption. The yearning for a "Messiah," for some divine power or being who would lift man from the depths into which he had sunk and redeem him from the evil of sin and the misfortunes of life and secure for him eternal happiness in a life beyond, was its strongest note.

The missionary spirit was remarkably vigorous, and every cult was inspired by the desire to become a world-religion. The political and social conditions of the Hellenistic world were also exceedingly conducive to the success of the missionary movement. It was a world unified by habits of thought, expression, and language. The universal acquaintance with Hellenistic Greek made intercourse free wherever Roman, Greek, Syrian, or Jew might meet. It was ruled by one power and the general prevalence of peace rendered travel easy and secure. In a word, the Hellenistic world was in every department of its life admirably prepared for the advent of the one and only religion which possessed within itself the capacity to make that world its own, the religion of Jesus Christ.

MAURICE JONES.

THE GENESIS OF THE ROMAN EPISTLE.

LIKE every other part of Holy Scripture, the whole body of Pauline literature has had to pass through the fires of literary criticism, but the great Roman Epistle has come through the trial unscathed, bearing not even the smell of singeing upon it. The almost universal consensus of sober opinion has accepted the epistle in its entirety as a genuine letter of the apostle Paul, written clearly from Corinth to an equally plain and definite destination. In the face of this practically unanimous verdict, it would seem an act of presumption to challenge the decision of competent scholars, and to suggest that the document should be placed back into the crucible, in order that its composite nature may be declared, and its component elements revealed. Our only justification for such an endeavour is the hope that the results of the enquiry may shed light upon some difficulties of New Testament interpretation.

There appears to be strong reason for believing that there was in circulation in the second century a shorter form of the Roman Epistle, which omitted the last two chapters. We have, it is true, no documentary evidence for the existence of this shorter form. Every manuscript which has come down to us includes both chapters xv. and xvi. We know, however, that the Old Latin versions divided the epistle into fifty-one chapters, each with its appropriate heading, and these original headings or breves have been preserved for us in at least forty-eight manuscripts of the Vulgate. The passage, Romans xiv. 15–23, is clearly enough indicated by the words, "De periculo contristante fratrem suum esca et potus sed justitia et pax et gaudium in spiritu sancto," which form the heading of No. 50. The last heading No. 51 reads: "De mysterio dei ante pas-

sionem in silentio habito post passionem vero ipsius revelato." These words must surely refer to the doxology which is to be found in Romans xvi. 25–27. The natural inference from the testimony of these breves is that a shorter form of the Roman Epistle must have existed at one time, which included only our fourteen chapters plus the doxology at the end of chapter xvi.

This judgment is confirmed by the position which the doxology occupies in the great majority of Greek manuscripts. In these manuscripts it appears between chapters xiv. and xv., and not at the end of chapter xvi., as in our English version. Recent scholarship is willing to admit that such a short recension of the epistle did at one time exist, but the general contention is that this shorter form was one which had been mutilated by Marcion, in order to cut out certain passages in the original letter which did not suit his peculiar tenets. We know from Rufinus' translation of Origen's Commentary on Romans xvi. 25–27 that Marcion did possess the epistle in its shorter form, but the fact that both Tertullian and Cyprian never use the excised passages goes a long way to disprove the Marcion hypothesis. From the evidence of Origen, Ambrosiaster and Codex G it is also clear that certain early manuscripts of the epistle lacked the words ἐν Ῥώμῃ in Romans i. 7 and 15.[1]

It was formerly believed that the epistle was written from Corinth during St. Paul's second or third missionary journeys; and if chapter xvi. be really part of the original letter, it is clearly impossible that the document could have been penned before the Aegean period of Paul's missionary travels. But if it be accepted that the short recension of the epistle was its original form, then it is quite possible to seek another date and occasion for its production. The

[1] Kirsopp Lake, in his book *The Earlier Epistles of St. Paul*, goes very fully into the discussion of these critical questions.

Galatian epistle was also thought to have Corinth as its place of origin, but there is a tendency on the part of recent scholars to seek an earlier date for this letter. McGiffert thinks that it was written only a few weeks after the Council at Jerusalem, whilst Lake would date it a few weeks previously, in the course of Paul's journey up to the Council from Antioch. If the Galatian epistle belongs to this early Antiochene period, then Lake's date is much to be preferred to McGiffert's. On this theory of Lake's, we overcome the difficulty occasioned by Paul's remark in the letter that he had only visited Jerusalem twice since his conversion. But if the epistle to the Galatians was written on Paul's journey up to Jerusalem, was not part of the Roman epistle penned at the same time? The similarities between the two epistles certainly suggest that they were almost contemporaneous. Is it not possible that the original draft of the Roman epistle may have formed the substance of Paul's plea before the Council at Jerusalem? What more likely than that, after sending off his fiery polemical epistle to the church in Galatia, the apostle should recast his argument in a more conciliatory tone likely to impress favourably the Jewish Council that was to meet in a few days?

The form and arrangement of the argument in the first eleven chapters of Romans suit this hypothesis perfectly. Paul begins with a dark picture of Gentile iniquity which would at once command the interest and appeal to the susceptibilities of his Jewish audience. But once he has by this introduction got the attention of the Council, he goes on to say that, if the Gentiles merited condemnation, so did the Jews also. Both equally stood in need of salvation, which was offered free to Jew and Gentile alike through faith in Jesus. The question is raised that this objective righteousness would tend to an increase of sin, and St. Paul at once rebuts this interpretation by his doctrine of sub-

jective righteousness. This leads on to the question of the place of the Jew in the Divine plan, which draws from Paul his brilliant philosophy of history, winding up with the statement that the gracious purpose of God might include the salvation of all men, a thought that, once uttered, seems to have startled the apostle himself by its very boldness, for he suddenly closes this section of his argument with a doxology. This skilful pleading won for Paul recognition of his doctrinal position from the Council, and the Gentiles were asked to observe three simple ethical rules, that they should keep themselves from idols, from fornication and from blood, *i.e.*, murder. In after years the reference to blood was interpreted as a food law, and this led to the insertion of the words "things strangled" into the Lucan text.

Considerable discussion has centred around the meaning which the Greek word ἱλαστήριον bears in Romans iii. 25. It has been translated in our English version "propitiation." Now propitiation raises certain ethical difficulties for the modern mind, and some scholars have suggested that ἱλαστήριον should have the same connotation in the epistle to the Romans as it has in the Greek Septuagint. In the Septuagint ἱλαστήριον is used to translate the Hebrew כַּפֹּרֶת, or lid of the ark, which has been rendered in our English Bible by the word "mercy-seat." The late Professor A. B. Bruce seems ready to favour this translation of ἱλαστήριον in the Roman Epistle, except for the difficulty involved in the use of a concept so unfamiliar to Greek readers. But if the original form of the epistle was a speech addressed to the Council of Jerusalem, consisting of Palestinian and Hellenistic Jews, then the objection falls to the ground, and we are thus left free to translate Paul's words as follows: "Christ Jesus whom God set forth as a mercy-seat through faith." Against this transla-

tion Deissmann argues that etymologically ἱλαστήριον cannot mean the lid of the ark, but, like our English rendering "mercy-seat," was used to denote the function of the object, rather than the object itself. But whilst all this is true, it does not meet the case. We might as well argue that etymologically we ought not to speak of a telescope table, nor use the word telescope to describe a railway accident. We are not dealing with the etymological meaning of ἱλαστήριον, but with its derived connotation made common and familiar through the use of the Greek Septuagint. If Paul was addressing Palestinian and Hellenistic Jews, he could quite reasonably have used the word in its secondary meaning.

Granting now that chapters i.–xi. were the substance of Paul's plea before the council, what is the purport of chapters xii.–xiv. ? Might not these three chapters be the mode in which Paul made known the decrees of the Council to his Gentile converts ? If ever there was a gentleman at heart, it was the apostle Paul. He felt that he could not insult his Gentile converts by giving them baldly the list of the decrees, as if to suggest that each Gentile Christian had been a murderer or a fornicator before his conversion. Paul knew that many Gentile Christians had lived pure and noble lives before they had consecrated themselves to Christ, and he sought therefore to give them the substance of the decrees in a homily upon Christian conduct in general. In Romans xiii. 1–9, where he enumerates the prohibitions mentioned by James, he does not lay them down as the enactment of the Council (as a piece of class legislation for the benefit of Gentiles only), but he includes them in his tabulation of the Hebrew decalogue, as if to declare their eternal purpose as part of the divine law for all men. After the council Paul sent to every Gentile church a copy of his successful plea, along with the three chapters which embody

the Jerusalem decrees; and this early document, we are bold enough to suggest, is the short recension of what afterwards became known as the Roman Epistle.

Some years afterwards Paul sent a copy of this early document, along with a covering letter, chapter xv., to Rome itself. In this letter Paul excused himself for not visiting them on the ground that they had already received the Gospel from other hands. Let them not think that it was timidity of any kind that kept him from coming to Rome! He was not ashamed of the Gospel of Christ, and he was ready to preach it among them also, on his way to Spain. He must, however, pay a visit to Jerusalem first. He had taken up a collection for the poor saints there, and he must convey the money to them.

Chapter xvi. is a letter given to Phebe, who was leaving the neighbourhood of Corinth for another city, either Rome or Ephesus. Formerly Rome was supposed to be the destination of Phebe, because her letter of recommendation forms part of the Roman epistle in our Bible. But doubt has been thrown upon this conjecture in recent years. It certainly appears strange that Paul should have as many friends as the letter suggests in a church not yet visited by him. The mention of Aquila and Priscilla has raised the question whether Ephesus might not have been the destination of Phebe. Certainly Paul had many friends there, and the last definite word we have of Aquila and Priscilla in the pages of the New Testament is to the effect that they had gone to take up their residence at Ephesus. The probability is that this letter of recommendation granted to Phebe had been laid by the church in Ephesus in their archives beside the earlier short recension of what is now known as the Roman epistle. Many years afterwards, when the archives were searched for Pauline material, this letter was found and was attached to the epistle lying beside it. The church

in Rome, already growing influential among all other congregations, gladly received a document which seemed to prove Paul's intimacy with many Roman friends.

According to the present hypothesis, then, the Roman epistle is a composite document containing four main strata: (1) chapters i.–xi., Paul's plea before the Council at Jerusalem; (2) chapters xii.–xiv., giving in a way calculated not to cause offence to Gentile readers the decrees of the Council; (3) chapter xv., the covering letter to Rome; (4) chapter xvi., the letter of recommendation granted to Phebe, who was probably on her way to Ephesus. The acceptance of this hypothesis paves the way for some interesting suggestions as to the relationship of Paul with both James and Peter, which we may develop in a later article.

A. M. Pope.

THE FORGIVENESS OF SINS IN THE OLD TESTAMENT.

It is a fact which is often forgotten or overlooked that the Old Testament is a very one-sided literature. On any view of inspiration, whether low or high, it was produced by most extraordinary men and presents to us the religious ideas of the most outstanding religious geniuses that the world has ever seen. Not the ordinary Hebrew of the rank and file speaks to us out of the long ago in those amazing books, but the religious aristocrat: some great preacher, some noble singer, some exiled patriot, some martyr in his agony, some soldier dying for the peace of Jerusalem, some prisoner of hope whose faith even *in articulo mortis* is still unquenchable. It is not necessary, of course, to suppose that no other literature than this was ever produced by the Hebrews. Every nation has had its mean and sordid scribblers as well as its

great and noble makers of thought, our own not by any means excepted. But in our case we have the often satisfactory, if humiliating, knowledge of who these people were, and an altogether too clear understanding of the evil they wrought. And we have sober records, plain unbiassed prose, of the good old times, records in which the good and the evil, the rude and the cultured, the godlike and the diabolical are faithfully put down for us.

To understand, e.g., the Germany of the Reformation it is not enough to know Martin Luther and Reuchlin and Philip Melanchthon. We must also know the cruelty and viciousness of the nobility, the unspeakable sufferings of the German serfs and the horrors of the Peasant War, when the Reformation failed the masses of the German people in their dark hour. In like manner it would be altogether too kind to Charles II. and the era of the Restoration in England to suppose that this age is typified by John Milton and John Bunyan. The life of the merry monarch and his courtiers and the vulgar and immoral writings of Dryden, Wycherly, Congreve and Vanbrugh must be set over against the calm beauty and purity of *Paradise Lost*, and the fine spirituality of the *Pilgrim's Progress*. The galaxy of famous Scots which made Edinburgh so brilliant in the days of Walter Scott, Burns, Jeffrey, Sidney Smith, Wilson, Black and Blair, must not blind us to the sombreness and hardship and too often grinding poverty of the great masses of the Scottish people both in town and country, so well described by Henry Grey Graham in his *Social Life of Scotland in the 18th Century*. There are so many things that we must know about a people or a race in order to form a proper conception of their life and thinking.

Now it is just in this respect that the Old Testament literature is most exasperating. There are so many things it does not tell us. Neither in the realm of history nor in

that of religious thinking have we anything like an adequate account of ancient Israel in the Old Testament. For example, the longest reign in Israel's history was that of Manasseh, a reign of half a century, *ca.* 700-650 B.C., yet the author of the Book of Kings does not give one single fact of history in his account in the 21st chapter, and that is the more tantalising when we recall that that is just the period when the Assyrian Empire reached its pinnacle of greatness, and its armies swept backward and forward through Palestine, between Egypt and Assyria. And in matters of religion it is the same. In the whole history of Hebrew religion, there are few events of such far-reaching importance as the appearance of the great prophets Amos and Hosea in the northern kingdom; but by the Old Testament historian their names are not even mentioned. And even the histories are coloured by the religious ideas of the writers. They did not write history for its own sake but to commend thereby the faith of the fathers. The story of their past was to them the story of one thing only, viz., how God had led Israel, rewarding the righteous and punishing the guilty according to His own righteous judgments. Hence they tell us what God said, and what God did, and how God repented because, according to their unswerving faith in God, those were the things He must do. Thus the very faith of the Old Testament makes a problem for the historical investigator. It has well been pointed out by Dr. Leckie that "doubtless the Almighty could have made us all philosophers, artists, musicians, poets; but doubtless He has not done so. The ordinary person will not become a Wagner or a Rubens though he live a thousand years." Which is just as true of religion. "The Hebrew scriptures are the record of the Aristocrats," or, as the New Testament puts it, "Holy men of God spake as they were moved by the Holy Ghost."

Now when we approach the problem of sin and its forgiveness in Old Testament times we must be on our guard against this very thing. It is easy enough to find out what Amos or Isaiah thinks about sin and forgiveness, but if we wish to know what Israel as a whole thought, we must look deeper and with greater care. And after all we do need to know what the people at large thought, for it was the nation of Israel that produced the great religious heroes. It was to the nation they brought their burning messages and for the nation that they suffered the loss of all things. "Your sins," said Savonarola to the Florentines, "your sins make me a prophet," and it was Israel's sins that made her prophets and her lawgivers and her psalmists. Sir Oliver Lodge is reported to have said that the modern man is not worrying about his sins. However that may be, the masters of religion in Old Testament times worried very much about it. The shame of sin is written large across their pages and the indignation of God follows after the fleeing conscience until it is run to earth. And further, nowhere else has the agony of repentance and the deep longing for forgiveness found such exquisite expression as in the classic pages of the Old Covenant.

> Remember, O Lord, Thy tender mercies and Thy lovingkindnesses,
> For they have been ever of old.
> Remember not the sins of my youth, nor my transgressions.
> According to Thy lovingkindness, remember Thou me,
> For Thy goodness sake, O Lord.
> For Thy name's sake, O Lord,
> Pardon mine iniquity, for it is great (Ps. xxv.).
>
> Is there no balm in Gilead, is there no Physician there?
> Why then is not the health of the daughter of my people recovered?
> (Jer. viii. 22.)

It must be remembered, however, that these are the cries of the adult conscience of the Hebrew nation; they are not the feelings of her youthful days, nor of the masses of her

people. At these earlier times, then, we must look as well as at the other.

1. It is pointed out first that the Old Testament is very largely the record of the struggle between pagan elements in Israel and the religion of Jahweh, the Lord and Father of the nation. It is the story of God's education of one of the Semitic nations through whom He chose to make Himself known to the world as through no other nation. Nothing is clearer from an examination of history than this fact, that God is a selective God. Why He did not chose Moab or Ammon or Babylon for the purpose of His self-revelation we do not know. There is no reason, doubtless, which we can see, why the people who worshipped Chemosh or Milcom or Marduk should not have been selected by the Almighty for this purpose as well as those who used the name Jahweh as their personal name for God. But the fact remains that it was not so done. The reality of the special revelation to the world through Israel remains rock-fast. Chemosh remained Chemosh and Milcom remained Milcom until Moab and Ammon and their gods with them were blotted out. But Jahweh of Israel became the God of all the earth, King of kings, Lord of lords, the Master and the Father of all mankind. Not all at once and not without fearful struggles and sufferings did Israel learn this and multitudes of her people never rose to it, but it was learned; and the principal process of that Divine education is written in the Old Testament.

We are to remember, then, that Israel had a pagan Semitic inheritance which the higher religion of Jahweh had to overcome; that when her national life began at the time of Moses, she had many inadequate and unworthy notions of God and man and conduct which had to be changed or even cut away altogether by the purer faith. Her conception of sin was very largely the common Semitic

notion of an offence. This offence might be moral, but not necessarily so. Indeed it might be an entirely involuntary thing done in perfect innocence and ignorance and yet be regarded as a grave offence against God. Thus Jonathan, ignorant of his father's curse, eats honey by the way and brings upon himself the death penalty thereby. Uzzah, anxious for the safety of the sacred Ark, puts forth his hand to steady it and is smitten down dead for his act. The prophetic historian of the Hexateuch relates how Pharaoh and Abimelech brought judgment on themselves by an offence of which they were ignorant. In Exodus iv. Jahweh charges Moses with his great mission to his fellow-countrymen and then immediately meets him on the road and tries to kill him, simply for the reason that the ceremonial rite of circumcision had been neglected. Morality, for the great mass of the people in the early days, meant compliance with custom, both ceremonial and social, and he who broke through the custom must pay the penalty. "It was not so done in Israel," says the author of Judges, even in those days when there was no king and every man did that which was right in his own eyes. He who wittingly or unwittingly violated social and ceremonial obligation was liable to punishment, even in some cases to death itself. "The fundamental meaning of the Hebrew word חָטָא is to be at fault, and the active form has the sense of missing the mark or object aimed at." In Judges xx. 16, e.g., we read: "Among all these people there were seven hundred chosen men left-handed; every one could sling stones at a hair-breadth and not miss" (וְלֹא יַחֲטִיא). "The notion of sin, there fore, is that of blunder, and the word is associated with others that indicate error, folly or want of skill and insight." 1 Samuel xxvi. 21: "I have sinned (חָטָאתִי): return, my Son David . . . behold I have played the fool (הִסְכַּלְתִּי), and have erred exceedingly (וָאֶשְׁגֶּה). It does not necessarily

mean an offence against God, but includes any act that puts a man in the wrong with those who have power to make him rue it. Thus 2 Kings xviii. 14: "And Hezekiah king of Judah sent to the king of Assyria at Lachish, saying, I have sinned; turn thou from me, and that which thou layest upon me, I will bear." 1 Samuel xx. 1: "And David said to Jonathan, What have I done, what is mine iniquity (עֲוֹנִי), and what is my sin before thy father . . . that he seeketh my life?" Genesis xxxi. 36: "Jacob answered and said unto Laban, "What is my trespass (פִּשְׁעִי), what is my sin, that thou hast hotly pursued after me?" Genesis l. 17: "So shall ye say unto Joseph, Forgive, I pray thee now, the transgression (פֶּשַׁע) of thy brethren and their sin, for they did unto thee evil (רָעָה)." Numbers xii. 11: "And Aaron said unto Moses, O my lord, lay not, I pray thee, sin upon us for that we have done foolishly (נוֹאֲלְנוּ) and for that we have sinned."

"The notion of sin, therefore, has no necessary reference to the conscience of the sinner, it does not necessarily involve moral guilt, but only, so to speak, forensic liability." (W. R. Smith.)

That this is the case among the great mass of the early Israelites is clear from a careful examination of the code of laws by which their religious and social life was regulated, viz., the Book of the Covenant (Exodus xx. 22–xxiii.). This code contains a minimum of really moral injunctions and a maximum of social and ceremonial obligations by which the simple life of the early agricultural community was to be governed. It contains a decalogue, which, however, is not the ethical decalogue of Exodus xx.

1. Ye shall not make other gods with me (xx. 23).
2. Gods of silver or gods of gold ye shall not make unto me (xx. 23).
3. The feast of unleavened bread shalt thou keep (xxiii. 15).
4. The firstborn of thy sons shalt thou give unto me, likewise

shalt thou do with thine oxen and with thy sheep (xxii. 29, 30).

5. Six days shalt thou labour and on the seventh day thou shalt rest, that thine ox and thine ass may have rest, and the son of thy handmaid and the sojourner may be refreshed (xxiii. 12).

6. Three times in the year shall all thy males appear before the Lord (xxiii. 17).

7. Thou shalt not offer the blood of my sacrifice with leavened bread (xxiii. 18).

8. The fat of my feast shall not remain all night until the morning (xxiii. 18).

9. The feast of the firstfruits of thy ground shalt thou bring into the house of Yahweh thy God (xxiii. 19).

10. Thou shalt not boil a kid (while still) in its mother's milk (xxiii. 19).

In the Judaic decalogue to be found in Exodus xxxiv., this list of injunctions is repeated in a form almost identical. It will be seen at once that the regulations in these lists do not indicate that early Hebrew religion was characterised by an overwhelming feeling of moral guilt. Indeed it was of a festal rather than a penitential character, and was full of joyousness. The nation was young and vigorous, and God had given the people a goodly land which, as compared with the desert, was a land of milk and honey, and of riches unknown before. Youth is not the time when we most expect to find the sensitive conscience. Religion for the young is more a matter of ideals and joyous energies and aspirations. The sense of the need of forgiveness grows upon us as we grow older, when we have missed many opportunities and neglected many duties. As G. A. Smith has pointed out, the years do not lessen or wear thin the sense of guilt in the soul of a Christian. Rather they bring out all the colour that is in it, red and awful to our eyes. Even so was it in the Hebrew nation; exuberant and exultant in the morning of their life, they gathered to their festivals to enjoy what Jahweh had bestowed upon them, too often, alas, with pagan accompaniments of drunkenness and sensuality.

But it was not all gladness. Misfortune in some form or other seldom passes a nation by for long and there were days of darkness and gloom in which the sound of singing ceased. Then it was that the burnt offerings to appease the wrath of Jahweh were multiplied in number and increased in value and even more terrible things were done that the heavy hand of an angry God might be removed. "And there was a famine in the days of David three years," which according to the view of the times indicated some terrible offence committed. And the seven remaining sons of the heroic King Saul whom David had so nobly lamented were delivered up and they hanged them in the mountain before Jahweh; and Rizpah, the daughter of Aiah, the mother of two of the slain kept her mother's vigil over the bones of the dead all through the deadly heat till the rain came, when, the writer says, God was entreated for the land. Truly, we have travelled a long way since God was supposed to be pleased in this fashion.

In short, then, for the masses of the people, in early Israel sin was not what we mean by the term, it was merely an offence which must be put right, lest the anger of heaven should descend upon the offender.

Now to meet this need the sacrificial system stood ready. For his joyousness and exultation the Hebrew like other Semites, had his thank-offering, or peace offering (שֶׁלֶם) the most common among the early sacrifices, where worshippers enjoyed the fellowship of God at a common feast; and for the times of darkness and despair the burnt offering (עֹלָה) or whole burnt offering (כָּלִיל) by which the fearful or sorely smitten people hoped to placate the anger of a wrathful God and turn His face toward them again. And as the fortunes of the nation sank lower and lower during the later monarchy and ruin and destruction stared Israel in the face, the multitude heaped offering upon offering

in order to turn away the great calamity. In their darkest moments they even reverted to the hideous pagan custom of human sacrifices. In the words of Scripture they caused their children to pass through the fire to Molech or Melek, not the name of a heathen deity, but a name of Jahweh as the Divine King. And that happened now which one might have anticipated. Ritual religion broke down under the intolerable strain to which it was subjected. The sufferings of Israel were too heavy to be borne by this creed and the nobler souls in Israel cast it from them as a vain thing. Which brings us now to the second stage in the moral history of the Hebrew nation, viz., that of

2. The Prophets. It has been pointed out above that religion for the mass of the people was essentially ritual and not moral; but there were always some who could not be content with externalism, to whom God must be a moral, not a physical Deity. It is a mistake to suppose that the great prophetic figures of the eighth century burst upon the world unheralded and utterly strange, like Athena, full-grown and full-armed from the head of Zeus. There had always been protesters against the common trust in sacrificial religion. The great founder of Israel, Moses himself, was anything but a mere ritualist. Making due allowance for all that tradition has done to enhance his greatness, Moses stands forth as the great titanic figure to whom under God Israel owed its national existence. And Jahweh to Moses was far more than a physical deity; He was the guardian of right and justice and the avenger of the injured and the guiltless. To Samuel also is attributed that memorable saying, "Behold to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken than the fat of rams." Nathan at the court of David upholds the ideals of righteousness and Elijah the Tishbite, in the name of Jahweh, threatens destruction to the house of Omri because of the murder of

Naboth. And doubtless there were others of these finer spirits of which we know nothing from the all-too-scanty literature of the age. All these, however, were but voices crying in the wilderness ; they accomplished little or nothing. The nation was too secure in its own strength. But by the middle of the eighth century things had changed. Israel had fought for 100 years with Aram, had suffered frightfully and in the end had emerged victorious to enjoy a brief and brilliant Indian summer before the final desolation of the winter. Jahweh had triumphed, His people were free, therefore on with the dance, let joy be unconfined. They did not hear that heavy sound striking like a rising knell. But Amos heard it amidst the festival " and caught its tone with Death's prophetic ear." It was the chariot wheels of the Assyrian, now almost on his way into Israel's land to tread it down and leave it a smoking desolation. Amos heard it and he and his successors in the goodly fellowship of the prophets are done for ever with this banqueting and sacrificing. " I hate, I despise your feasts, and I will take no delight in your solemn assemblies. Yea, though ye offer me your burnt-offerings and meal-offerings I will not accept them ; neither will I regard the peace-offerings of your fat beasts. Take thou away from me the noise of thy songs, for I will not hear the melody of thy viols ; But let justice roll down as waters and righteousness as a mighty stream. Did ye bring unto me sacrifices and offerings in the wilderness forty years, O house of Israel ? " " You have had," says Amos, " your fearful sufferings during those terrible hundred years, famine and pestilence and blasting and mildew and locusts and palmer-worms and battle and death and finally victory ; and what has it all resulted in ? Sacrifices and offerings, a sorry tribute. Ye have not returned unto me." " Ye that turn justice to wormwood and cast down righteousness to the earth, seek Jahweh and ye shall

live, lest He break out like fire in the house of Joseph."

And Hosea is equally plain, but with a pain at his heart which Amos does not shew. "O Ephraim, what shall I do with thee? O Judah, what shall I do unto thee? for your goodness is as a morning cloud and as the dew that goeth early away. Therefore have I hewed them by the prophets; I have slain them by the words of my mouth, and my judgments are as the light that goeth forth. For I desire goodness and not sacrifice, and the knowledge of God more than burnt-offerings." "There is no truth, nor goodness, nor knowledge of God in the land. There is nought but swearing and breaking faith and killing and stealing and committing adultery: they break out and blood toucheth blood, therefore shall the land mourn."

And hear Isaiah, the prophet-statesman of Jerusalem in the days when Judah had been scourged by Sennacherib. "What unto me is the multitude of your sacrifices? saith Jahweh. I have had enough of the burnt offerings of rams and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks or of lambs or of he-goats. Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination to me; New moon and Sabbath, the calling of assemblies I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting. When ye spread forth your hands I will hide mine eyes from you. Yea, when ye make many prayers I will not hear; your hands are full of blood. Wash you, make you clean, cease to do evil, learn to do well; seek justice, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow."

And Isaiah's younger contemporary Micah has penned for us that classic description of "morality to the uttermost" (G. A. Smith). "Wherewithal shall I come before Jehovah, and bow myself before the high God? Shall I come before him with burnt offerings, with calves of a year old? Will Jehovah be pleased with thousands of

rams or with ten thousands of rivers of oil? Shall I give my firstborn for my transgression? the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He hath showed thee, O man, what is good, and what doth Jehovah require of thee but to do justly and to love mercy and to walk humbly with thy God?"

And the greatest of them all was Jeremiah.

"I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt concerning burnt-offerings and sacrifices; but this thing I commanded them, saying, Hearken unto my voice, and I will be your God and ye shall be my people, and walk in all the way I command you." But now, "the harvest is past, the summer is ended, and we are not saved." Thus, and in many other words of irony, biting satire and terrible threatenings, did the prophets denounce the popular ideas of sin and its forgiveness. "What you call sin," they say, "is not sin at all, because you are blind to what God really demands of you. You rob and slay your fellow-man and commit every wrong, and think to cover it all with a sacrifice. I tell you," says the prophet, "your peace-offering is nothing but a festival of pagan drunkenness, and your burnt offering a vain blasphemous attempt to bribe the Judge of all the earth. The only thing that will save you is repentance and reformation. Get the blood-stains off your hands before you lift them to me in prayer." "Return, return, return unto Jehovah, and He will have mercy," that is the theme of all the prophets: "He hath smitten, and He will bind us up."

Now truth has to make its way slowly into the stubborn hearts of men and these ideas of the prophets were too revolutionary to find instant acceptance. Externalism in religion dies hard, and though the Deuteronomic reformation under Josiah embodied many of the prophetic ideas,

it was really a compromise between prophetism and ritualism. It required the anguish and sorrow of the exile to convince Israel that the prophets were right. The nation before its fall never really accepted their teaching; even the Deuteronomic reformation was not a popular movement, and with the death of Josiah it collapsed like a house of cards. Prophetic threats and pleadings were alike in vain, the wildest anarchy and fanaticism held sway until the crash came in 586 B.C., and Jerusalem, ploughed as a heap, bore tragic evidence to all that was left of Israel, that the prophet had indeed spoken in the name of the Most High.

3. We now come to the final period of our study, the exilic and post-exilic times.

In a foreign land the Jews had ample opportunity to reflect on their prophets' message in the light of their own sorrows and the death of their nation. They did not all accept the prophets' view. Some complained bitterly, so Ezekiel tells us, "the way of Jahweh is not equal," and protested that they had not deserved this. "It was not our fault" "The fathers have eaten sour grapes, and the children's teeth are set on edge," and in some of the Psalms we can hear Israel's passionate justification of herself. But for the best, if not also the most, of the exiles the prophet had been vindicated. Israel did not need to be told after the return from the exile that paganism must be kept out of her religion. She was ready to fight and to die in the three centuries that followed that the pure religion of her God should not be defiled by Samaritan, or Greek, or Roman. And if Judaism came to be characterised by a narrow exclusiveness that shews at its worst in some of the people of the New Testament, we must remember that it produced John and Stephen and Paul as well as Judas and Caiaphas. The law which was set up to guard the post-exilic congregation from insidious outside influence

may have been a hedge of thorns ; but behind it there grew up, in many, a fine and most fragrant personal piety, made possible by the very harshness of the defence. It is a common mistake to suppose that the religion of Judaism exhausted, or nearly exhausted itself in ritual. And the greatest proof of this mistake is the Psalter where pure religion finds its finest expression in all the Old Testament literature. The fact is that the Levitical law is a religious constitution which recognises the truth of the prophetic view of God and of conduct and at the same time the impossibility of a religion without sacrificial ritual for the people of that age. Thus the Levitical regulations as to sacrifice, clergy, offerings, lustrations, purifications, etc., are all most carefully worked out with nothing left to chance or whim ; but the range and efficacy of these things is strictly limited. Only the unwitting sins could be removed through the regulations of the cultus. For sins done with a " high hand " there was no atonement provided. The only hope of such sinner was in repentance and the mercy of God. It is very important to remember this distinction because it shows how the law tries to do justice to the prophetic ideal of religion and at the same time keep and regulate the ceremonial worship which after all was indispensable in those days. The wilful sinner could bring no sin-offering or trespass-offerings ; he was cut off unless a merciful God Himself should save him ; and wilful sin is after all, in our way of thinking, the only real sin. A thing done in ignorance may be an offence but not a sin, in the sense in which the prophets understood sin. The cries for forgiveness and restoration to God's favour which we hear in the Psalms, are those of sinners for whom the Law with its sacrifices and atonement, held out no hope.

" For thy name's sake, O Jahweh, pardon mine iniquity, for it is great ; turn thee unto me and have mercy upon

me, for I am desolate and afflicted; consider mine afflictions and my travail, and forgive all my sins" (Psalm xxv.).

"Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven, whose sin is covered. Blessed is the man to whom Jahweh imputeth not iniquity, and in whose spirit there is no guile. When I kept silence my bones wasted away through my groaning all the day long . . . I acknowledged my sins unto thee, and mine iniquity did I not hide. I said, I will confess my transgressions unto Jahweh, and thou forgavest the iniquity of my sin" (Psalm xxxii.). There is no word of sacrificial atonement here, but of God's great mercy and immediate forgiveness.

Still more explicit is Psalm xl. "Sacrifice and offering thou hast no delight in. Mine ears hast thou opened. Burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required. Then said I, 'Lo I come, in the roll of the book it is written of me. I delight to do thy will, O my God. Yea, thy law is written in my heart."

And clearest of all is Psalm li.:

"Create in me a clean heart, O God, and renew a right spirit within me. . . . Thou delightest not in sacrifice, else would I give it. Thou hast no pleasure in burnt-offerings. The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit; a broken and a contrite heart, O God, thou wilt not despise." It is in such words as these that we find the deepest teaching the Old Testament has to give in the matter of the forgiveness of sins, for the last word in the Old Testament is not sacrifice, but penitence.

We see, then, how the Law, while it still kept the sacrificial element, made a place for the prophet and his teaching by placing the sins done with "a high hand" outside of the circle of the law's effectiveness. But it did more than that, for even within that circle it made remission of sins and uncleannesses a far more awful thing than it had ever

been before. The peace-offering or sacrificial feast formerly so festal in its character, is reduced in the Priest's Code to a position of insignificance; it is entirely dwarfed by the burnt-offering, which is quite the reverse of the older order of importance. And in addition to this greater importance of the burnt-offering provision is made for two sacrifices which are quite new, the sin-offering (חַטָּאת) and the guilt-offering (אָשָׁם), neither of which is found in the early legislation or in Deuteronomy. The mere general burnt-offering is now not enough. The individual offender is obliged to bring his offering for his own sin, and on its due presentation and offering the priest makes atonement for him and he is cleansed. This offering was usually a bloody one and varied according to the wealth or poverty of the offender. But in cases of extreme poverty the tenth part of a bushel of flour might be offered as a sin-offering, of which the priest burned a handful upon the altar and was permitted to retain the remainder for himself. The whole account (in Lev. v.) indicates that it is the confession and the gift that are the essence of the act and not the shedding of the blood, but in actual practice the bloody offerings for sin far outnumbered the others. The whole system of sacrifices and offerings for sin culminated in the great Day of Atonement, on the tenth day of the seventh month (Tishri) and the great sin-offering for the whole nation. This ceremony is the highest pinnacle of the whole Levitical system. The day began with a sacrifice by the high priest of a bull as a sin-offering for himself and for the priesthood in general. Its blood was carried by him into the דְּבִיר and there sprinkled in a minutely prescribed manner. The sin-offering of the congregation, a he-goat, was then offered and its blood sprinkled in like manner both in the דְּבִיר and הֵיכָל, and finally on the head of another goat the sins of the people were symbolically and solemnly laid by the high

priest, and this animal was not slain (Israel offers to God no animal laden with impurity), but sent away into the wilderness for Azazel (לַעֲזָאזֵל), the evil demon inhabiting the waste and desolate lands. Sin is thus removed from the congregation, being sent away to the being to whom it naturally belongs, and the land is purged of its uncleanness.

Now the great weakness in this system was the vicious line which it attempted to draw in the matter of sin. It is a dangerous thing to make a distinction between unwitting sins and sins done with a high hand. Even in Leviticus itself we may see this, for in chapter vi. 1–7 the line is clearly overstepped. "If any one sin and commit a trespass against Jahweh and deal falsely with his neighbour in the matter of a deposit, or a bargain, or of robbery, or have oppressed his neighbour, or have found that which was lost and deal falsely therein and swear to a lie, in any or all these things that a man doeth sinning therein; then it shall be if he hath sinned and is guilty that he shall restore that which he took by robbery or the thing which he hath gotten by oppression or the deposit which was committed to him, or the lost thing which he found, or anything about which he hath sworn falsely; he shall even restore it in full and shall add a fifth part more thereto; and he shall bring his trespass offering unto Jahweh . . . and the priest shall make atonement for him before Jahweh and he shall be forgiven." These things are clearly not what we could properly call "unwitting sins," and the temptation to discount the seriousness of sin must always have been very great. Under the Hasmonean priest-kings who followed Simon Maccabeus, the priesthood became hopelessly worldly and political, and bribery and even assassination were resorted to. And while the Temple ritual with its atoning sacrifices was being scrupulously carried out, sins that cried to heaven for punishment were hurrying the Jewish people to ruin. The

very office in which the whole Levitical structure reached its apex, the high priesthood, became debased and prostituted till we have the extraordinary spectacle of a high priest sending 300 drachmas of silver to Tyre for a sacrifiec to Heracles and the Jerusalem priesthood undertaking to instal a heathen civilisation. The classification of sins into "unwitting" and "sins done with a high hand" had surely brought nemesis in its train when the ministers of the atoning sacrifice for unwitting sins were themselves guilty of the worst enormities.

The Psalms of Solomon complain bitterly of this disloyalty to the sacred office, and give vent to great grief for the miseries of the nation.

Psalm i. 8. Their transgressions went beyond those of the heathen before them.
They utterly polluted the holy things of the Lord.
Psalm ii. 3. Because the sons of Jerusalem had defiled the holy things of the Lord.
Had profaned the offerings of God.
Psalm viii. 13. They trod the altar of the Lord coming straight from all manner of uncleanness.
They left no sin undone, wherein they surpassed not the heathen.
They defiled Jerusalem and the things that had been hallowed to the name of God.

Legalism indeed had destroyed itself. By divorcing the ritual from the moral, it ended in reducing morality to ritualism and in destroying the righteousness which it aimed at first to preserve. It ended in an *impasse*, it could go no further and do no more.

But we should be sadly wrong if we thought that all Jewish ideas of forgiveness were bound up with sacrifice. The non-canonical literature is proof to the contrary. One of the most remarkable statements on the subject of forgiveness in pre-Christian Judaism is in the pseudepigraphic work called the *Testament of the Twelve Patriarchs*, a passage which treats not only of God's forgiveness of man, but also

of man's forgiveness of his neighbour. In the Testament of Gad we read as follows :

" Beware, therefore, my children, of hatred, for it worketh lawlessness even against the Lord Himself. For it will not hear the words of His commandment concerning the loving of one's neighbour and it sinneth against God. For as love would quicken even the dead and would call back them that are condemned to die, so hatred would slay the living, and those that had sinned even venially it would not suffer to live. For the spirit of hatred worketh together with Satan through hastiness of spirit, in all things to men's death ; but the spirit of love worketh together with the law of God in long-suffering unto the salvation of men . . . love ye therefore one another from the heart ; and if a man sin against thee, speak peaceably to him and in thy soul hold not guile ; and if he repent and confess, forgive him. But if he deny it, do not get into a passion with him lest, catching the poison from thee, he take to swearing and so thou sin doubly. And though he deny it, and yet have a sense of shame when reproved, give over reproving him, for he who denieth may repent so as not again to wrong thee ; yea he may also honour thee and be at peace with thee. And even if he be shameless and persist in wrong-doing, even so forgive him from the heart, and leave to God the avenging." In the writer of these noble words and in teachers like him we may surely see the human ancestry of the great Teacher who taught not as the scribes, but with authority.

But as the best expression of penitence and sorrow for sin we may take the Prayer of Manasses, a work of the first century, B.C.

" O Lord most High, of great compassion, long-suffering, and abundant in mercy, Thou, O Lord, according to Thy great goodness hast promised repentance and forgiveness to them

that have sinned against Thee, and of Thine infinite mercies hast appointed repentance unto sinners that they may be saved. Thou therefore, O Lord, that art the God of the just, hast not appointed repentance to the just, to Abraham and Isaac and Jacob, which have not sinned against Thee; but Thou hast appointed *repentance unto me that am a sinner;* for I have sinned above the number of the sands of the sea . . . I did not Thy will, neither have I kept Thy commandments. I have set up abominations and have multiplied detestable things. Now therefore I bow the knee of mine heart, beseeching Thee for grace. I have sinned, O Lord, I have sinned and acknowledge mine iniquities; but I humbly beseech Thee, forgive me, O Lord, forgive me and destroy me not with mine iniquities. Be not angry with me for ever by reserving evil for me. For Thou, O Lord, art the God of them that repent, and in me Thou wilt shew all Thy goodness. For Thou wilt save me, that am unworthy, according to Thy great mercy. And I will praise Thee for ever all the says of my life; for all the host of heaven doth sing Thy praise, and Thine is the glory for ever and ever. Amen." Surely he who wrote this might have stood as a sample of the publican: "God be merciful to me, a sinner."

We see, then, how in Galilee especially (for both these works are Galilean) there was to be found a noble piety that longed for purity and pardon and looked for the consolation of Israel. These men knew in their souls that the blood of bulls and goats could not take away sin. It was from these that the disciples came, for they were all Galileans except the traitor. It was of them also that the Saviour of the world came, in whom the law of the Spirit of life made man free from the law of sin and death. "Israel, following after a law of righteousness, did not arrive at that law. Wherefore? because they sought it not by faith, but, as it were, by works" (Romans ix. 31).

Twice, then, in the history of the Hebrew nation the faith of Israel was threatened with extinction ; once in the time of the Babylonian Nebuchadrezzar, and again in the time of the Roman Cæsars. On both occasions externalism in religion collapsed in absolute failure. But God is ever mindful of His own. In the former great crisis faith was saved by the word of the prophet and lived on for ages after Nebuchadrezzar had ceased to be ; in the latter case by the Word Incarnate, who was made flesh and dwelt among us, whose kingdom is everlasting.

Not all the blood of beasts
On Jewish altars slain
Could give the guilty conscience peace
Or wash away the stain.

. . . . .

Thy grace alone, O Lord,
To me can pardon speak ;
Thy power alone, O Son of God,
Can this sore bondage break.

H. A. KENT.

ALEXANDER JOHN SCOTT.[1]

A FEW summers ago I spent the afternoon of a perfect June day in the lovely little cemetery at Clarens overlooking the blue waters of the lake of Geneva and surrounded by great mountains. I had gone there in search of the graves of Alexander Vinet, the distinguished Swiss theologian, the Pascal of the Reformed Church, as he has been called, and of Frederick Henri Amiel, whose journal Mrs. Humphrey Ward first introduced to English readers. As I strolled through that beautiful and peaceful cemetery where rests all that is mortal of a large company of Russian, German, French and English people, I came unexpectedly on a

[1] A Lecture given before the London Society for the Study of Religion by the late Rev. John Hunter, D.D.

simple stone on which was engraved a name with which I had been long familiar. It bore this inscription :—

"In memory of A. J. Scott, M.A., who died at Veytaux, January 12th, 1866. 'If any man will do the will, he shall know the doctrine.' —John vii. 17. 'Thou wilt show me the path of Life, in Thy presence is fulness of joy.' Psa. xvi. 11."

If it be the unpardonable sin, as Carlyle tells us it is, not to know a great man when he appears, then the generation to which Alexander John Scott belonged was guilty. When I first lectured on Scott in the early nineties, I was told that there were not twenty persons in the city of Glasgow who knew anything about him. His name, I was assured, would awaken no association and no interest, and in devoting an evening to his life and work I was offering sacrifice to an unknown god. The people to whom the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* is the one infallible book on all literary matters, and who appear to believe that anything which cannot be found inside its sacred boards must be of very secondary importance were also puzzled. For, strange to relate, though the *Encyclopaedia Britannica* contained notices of one great Scott, the immortal Sir Walter, and of three or four other Scotts not so great, it had not a line about A. J. Scott.

It is true that A. J. Scott was and is, comparatively an unknown man. In his lifetime society knew little of him. He gathered his disciples, but not in crowds. Wonderful speaker though he was, his audiences were everywhere small. The day of the speaking men who rush to the newspapers with copy had not yet dawned. Sensationalism was generally regarded as beneath the level where walk the prophets of God. In quietness and confidence was their strength.

It may be asked, why Scott was not better known in his time and is still so little known. In the first place he

was without worldly ambition. He had no care for popularity. He could not stoop to conquer. He gave his message in his own high, great way to the souls that desired it and knew its worth, and never sought to force his word or personality upon unwilling or unresponsive people. In the quiet pursuit of truth, in the still air of delightful studies, in the vocation of the scholar, in the great and responsible offices of the teacher, he found the end and reward of living.

Secondly, he never published anything. His name is not associated with any great book which gathers up into itself his message or his personality. It is to be found only on a few old pamphlets and on a thin volume of lectures and discourses published after his death. Though he was a man of extraordinary personal force and rare insight—one of the great moral and religious teachers of the last century, the teacher of some of our best teachers, the inspirer of the men who did most to frame the best theology of their time—yet such was his wonderful power of clothing thought in perfect speech without previous writing, that he left practically nothing to show after generations what manner of a man he was. In his later years he found it difficult, almost impossible, to write. "The suggestions of limitless power in his lecturing," said one of his distinguished students, "seemed altogether falsified when he took to writing." He was emphatically a speaker and not a writer.

Though his life was without any of those experiences and dramatic movements and situations which excite popular attention, it is one whose story for that very reason ought not to be forgotten.

As a public teacher, he was before his time. Thinkers of his type are never very prominent, and never understood in the period to which they belong. He was one of the few men who may be found in every age who think and

speak for themselves, and cannot be included in the general categories of society ; who do not readily fall into line with political parties, who stand outside all the churches, or, if they remain in them, are constantly striving for modification and expansion. They are not so much at variance with their age as in advance of it, the prophets of its awakening mind and soul, the voices of its inarticulate or half-articulate thought, shaping into clearness its cloudy aspirations and saying what all men who think and feel deeply are trying to say. Accustomed as we are now to the message of Scott and his school, it is perhaps difficult for those who are not endowed with imaginative sympathy to realise what a disturbing and dividing element that message was seventy years ago both in England and Scotland. The religious teacher, as distinct from the popular divine, often holds his place by virtue of a manly martyrdom. So it came to pass that this gifted and devout man, born and bred a preacher, lived for the most part among a people who failed to appreciate the work he was best fitted to do and whose attitude toward him was that of distrust and of veiled or open antagonism. "Many that are first shall be last, and the last shall be first." The supreme thing after all is not to be considered a great man, but to be a great man. A. J. Scott was a great man. If power is to be measured by its penetrating and permanent effect on the churches and the lives of those who come under its influence, then we must give him a place among those whom Carlyle calls "the aristocracy of the wisest." In his later life he belonged to no party or school, yet men of opposite parties and schools of thought were drawn to him.

Four books which I have had on my library shelves for many years I find dedicated to Scott. Henry Solly published in 1861 a thoughtful book on the doctrine of

the Atonement from the Arian point of view, which contains the following Dedication: "To one through whom the wise receive increase of wisdom and the teachers are taught; by whom lonely seekers after truth are encouraged, and those who labour, however humbly, in an earnest yet catholic spirit for its diffusion are welcomed and upheld, to Alexander John Scott, professor of mental and moral philosophy in Owen's College, Manchester, this essay is inscribed."

James Baldwin Brown, one of the most liberal and cultured of English Noncomformist preachers of the last generation, dedicated a volume of discourses to Scott:

"To the memory of my beloved and honoured teacher A. J. Scott, M.A., whose whole life was a witness to the truth which I have here endeavoured to set forth and who fell asleep while these pages were passing through the press, I inscribe them with that reverent love which is only made immortal by death." [1]

In 1857, Frederick Denison Maurice published a treatise on Medieval Philosophy, which has a dedicatory letter —too long to quote—addressed to Scott and concluding with characteristic humility: "Pray forgive this long dedication, my presumption in offering you a book about a subject which you understand so much better than the writer of it. I had some scruple in presenting it to you, knowing that from many opinions in it you would entirely dissent; and knowing also, from painful experience, that I may do injury to a friend by associating my name with his. But I could not deny myself the blame of saying how much I owe to your kindness and wisdom."

In George Macdonald's novel, *Robert Falconer*—an epoch-making book in the spiritual history of many thoughtful

[1] *Home Life in the Light of the Divine Idea.* 1866. He also dedicated an earlier volume in these words: "To A. J. Scott, A.M., the wisest teacher of the truth as the truth is in Jesus whom I have ever known."

young men thirty or thirty-five years ago—these words occur: "To the memory of the man who stands highest in the oratory of my memory, Alexander John Scott, I daringly presume to offer this book." In a long letter containing some reminiscences of Scott's unquestioned power and influence which I received from Macdonald some years before his death, he says: "They may help you to realise what I thought and think of the man—the greatest man I have ever known—if I may use a form which implies a power of judging which I do not possess."

In an early volume of poetry published in 1857 there are two poems addressed by Macdonald to Scott.[1] In the first, he refers to the day when he first saw him, a preacher in a modest temple.

> For like Truth's herald . . .
> I heard thy voice and humbly loved it, more
> Than any voice of power I heard before.

Daniel Macmillan, the publisher, in a letter writes: "I have heard Scott deliver four lectures on the Reformation: I have never heard or read anything on the same subject at all equal to them. . . . His many-sidedness is really wonderful. . . . He is, I think, second to few men of our time or any time. . . . Shortly after I saw his two lectures on "Schism" announced. My brother and I went. We were surprised not only at his depth and clearness, but that so noteworthy a man should be so little known. Just at this time the death of that noble-minded and noble-hearted man, Dr. Arnold . . . fell heavily on the heart of those who feel an interest in the welfare of our country, and know the value of a true priest. It really was cheering to me at such a time to learn that we had another noble-

[1] In the two volumes of *Poetical Works* published by Chatto & Windus in 1893, these poems are included (vol. i. pp. 271–2 and 280–1), but the lines here quoted are altered almost out of recognition.

hearted, truth-loving man—as yet scarcely known."[1]

Thomas Erskine and John Macleod Campbell were the two men who knew Scott best, and though they had a wide acquaintance with distinguished men, yet they separately declared that Scott was the man above all others they ever met who impressed them with a sense of mental and spiritual superiority. "You did not know," wrote Campbell to Bishop Ewing, "our valued friend Scott, of whom Mr. Erskine says that he impressed him more than any other man had, and of whom I can say the same."[2]

Alexander John Scott was born in Greenock in 1805. His father, Dr John Scott, was minister of one of the three parishes into which the town of Greenock was then divided. His parents were highly cultivated, so that from his childhood he had every faculty developed and educated. To this early training may doubtless be traced his wide culture and refined taste.

From the Grammar School of his native place Scott was sent, at the age of fourteen, to the University of Glasgow, where he remained till he was twenty-one. He was then licensed by the Presbytery of Paisley to preach the Gospel. In the meantime he accepted a tutorship in Edinburgh, and while there he attended some of the principal medical classes in the University. It was at this early period of his life (1826) that he became acquainted with Thomas Erskine, who had recently published his two books on *The Evidences of Christianity* and *The Freeness of the Gospel*, which were in perfect sympathy with Scott's own mind, and closely cemented a friendship which lasted through

[1] *Memoir of Daniel Macmillan*, by Thomas Hughes, Q.C., 1882, pp. 102–3. The entire letter is relevant and interesting (cf. also pp. 119, 213—"Hare thinks very highly of him. I am sure he admires him more, and thinks him a greater man than Carlyle").

[2] *Letters of Thomas Erskine*, vol. ii. p. 181.

life. In 1828 Erskine went with him to Greenock on a visit to his father. To these early days Erskine refers in a letter to Mrs. Scott written immediately after her husband's death. "I look back on my first acquaintance with him—in his youthful beauty—and with that rich endowment of mental and spiritual understanding. I recall my walks and talks with him by the side of the Gareloch; and the unfailing, loving, and admiring interest which I have ever since felt in himself and in his thoughts and movements. . . . I felt him to be a precious gift of God."

About the same time Scott became acquainted with John MacLeod Campbell, then minister of Row. Writing of a Sunday in the summer of 1827, Campbell says, ". . . my pulpit was occupied by my young friend Mr. Scott. I heard him with very peculiar delight. His preaching, though his second Sabbath, was with a sober, solemn composure that would have seemed a delightful attainment in a man of much experience. The progress he has already made in the divine life, the elevation and clearness of his views, the spirit of love which he breathes in every word, and the single-eyed devotedness to his Master's glory, are to me the most delightful illustrations of the power of simple faith."[1]

All through life Erskine and Campbell and Scott were intimate friends, each finding in the others what he found in none beside. "Intellectually, socially, spiritually," says Dr. Hanna, the editor of Erskine's Letters, "they moved in separate orbits; each having a path of his own, which with absolute independence he pursued. But the paths lay very close to one another; and so entirely on the same plane, sloping upwards to the great central Source of light and life and love, as to constitute a separate sphere of

[1] *Reminiscences and Reflections by the late J. M. Campbell*, edited by his son, 1873, p. 22.

religious ideas, aims, and aspirations, apart from and far above that of many with whom their names came afterwards to be associated."[1]

For some time Scott remained in the West of Scotland preaching here and there and attaining a degree of popularity as a preacher which delighted his friends though it seems to have troubled him. He assisted Story of Roseneath, and Campbell at Row, who in old age wrote of him to a common friend as "our dear Scott, my early fellow-helper in the Gospel." Before long, however, Scott's friends in Greenock and elsewhere were distressed to find that he was giving up his preaching appointments, and beginning to think that he could no longer conscientiously continue his ministerial career. He was passing through a season of darkness and doubt, as most honest and earnest spirits have to do. He had ceased to believe in the traditional Calvinism of the Scottish Kirk, having embraced Campbell's views of the universal Love of God and a universal Atonement, and, though more deeply rooted than ever in the simple teaching of Jesus, he thought he was losing his hold on saving truth because he could no longer accept some of the doctrines of the Westminster Confession.

It was about this time, the summer of 1828, that Edward Irving met Scott and arrived very rapidly at the same estimate of him as had Erskine and Campbell. Writing to Dr. Chalmers a month or two later Irving says: "Sandy Scott is a most precious youth, the finest and strongest faculty for pure theology I have yet met with."[2] This intercourse led Irving to invite Scott to become his assistant at Regent's Square Church, London. "I cannot accept it," answered Scott sadly; "I have told you all

[1] *Letters of Thomas Erskine of Linlathen*, vol. i. p. 131.
[2] *Life of Edward Irving*, by Mrs. Oliphant, p. 255.

my unbelief." "Never mind, never mind," exclaimed Irving with all the generous fervour of his noble nature. "Come along with me, you shall be free as air."

Thus unfettered by any pledge as to doctrine, Scott went with Irving to London, grateful beyond description for this most seasonable rescue from the gloom that was deepening around him. He became Irving's companion and fellow-labourer and gained no small measure of popular favour. Irving rejoiced in all the proofs of his young assistant's success. In his large heart there was no room for jealousy. Scott could never forget how on one great occasion in the presence of a vast congregation Irving put his hand upon his assistant's head and said, "Listen, my people, to this young man. He has the spirit of God in him. Much do I learn from him." He also wrote of him in 1830, after two years' experience of him in the most trying of clerical relationships: "A young man so learned and accomplished in all kinds of discipline I have never met with, and as pious as he is learned—and of great, very great discernment, with truth, and faithfulness Godward and manward."

During these years Scott was giving much time to the study of the life of the early Church. He found as an element of that life unusual gifts of healing and speaking with tongues. He preached some sermons on the subject in the West of Scotland during a visit there. They led to an extraordinary movement on the side of the Gareloch, at Port-Glasgow and other places. Many good people were led to pray for and to expect the restoration of miraculous gifts to the Church. In a short time some of them claimed the power to work miraculous cures and also to speak with tongues. The excitement spread from Scotland to London. Irving was entirely carried away with it. In a paper which he contributed to *Fraser's Magazine* concerning the origin, progress and results of the movement, he stated that it

was reserved to Scott "to sow the seed which had borne this precious fruit." "As we went in and out together he used often to signify to me his conviction that the spiritual gifts ought still to be exercised in the Church, that we are at liberty, and indeed bound, to pray for them."[1]

Scott greatly modified his views upon this subject, and though he continued to hold theoretically that the gifts might still be bestowed if the Church were worthy to receive them he doubted some of the manifestations which completely carried Irving away. One recalls here the words of William Blake: "Edward Irving was a sent man, but they who are sent sometimes go further than they ought."

This change of view led to a separation between Irving and Scott. It broke down Scott's health, but it did not touch the friendship between the two men. In a paper which he contributed to the *Sunday At Home* in 1881, entitled "Some Recollections of Professor Scott," the late Rev. C. M. Birrell, of Liverpool, gives a picture of Scott about this period:

"The first time I saw Scott was all but half a century ago in the church in Regent's Square where Edward Irving held small meetings in the winter mornings to foster the gift of tongues. The president, with his parted hair, still dark as night, sat back in his chair below the pulpit, and behind the shade of the solitary lamp which stood on the table below him. In the course of the meeting, a lady, after rocking backwards and forwards for a few moments, sprang to her feet and vociferated inarticulate cries which passed at length into rapid repetitions of the phrase 'He is coming!' Irving threw himself forward on his elbows, and buried his face in his hands, as if overcome with awe; but Scott, who had offered prayer earlier in the meeting, and whom I now discerned under the beams which had

[1] *Life of Edward Irving*, by Mrs. Oliphant, 4th edition, p. 275.

just struggled through the brown air into the church, sat erect, with compressed lips and knit brows, as if keeping his intellect poised for the formation of right judgment. The two men were revealed in those attitudes. The one fell below the fascination; the other stood firmly beyond its range."

In October, 1830, the Scottish Congregation at Woolwich invited Scott to become their minister. Acceptance of this invitation involved ordination by the Presbytery of London, and that again involved subscription to the Westminster Confession of Faith. In these circumstances, and before the call was in his hands, he thought it right to let the Presbytery know his attitude to the Confession. "Not believing that I could, consistently with truth, sign as my confession of faith a statement in which it is asserted that none are redeemed by Christ but the elect only . . .; seeing I believe that God would have all men to be saved and come to the knowledge of the truth, in testimony whereof Christ gave Himself a ransom for all men; having also a firm conviction that the Sabbath and the Lord's day are not, as stated in the Confession, one ordinance but two, perfectly distinct, one Jewish and the other Christian; believing that the powers enumerated (ch. 30, sect. 2) are greater in kind than could have been conferred on me by the imposition of the hands of the Presbytery, while by accepting ordination I should recognise in them a right and ability to convey such powers, I may not accept ordination while my signing the Westminster Confession is made the condition of my receiving it. . . ."[1]

Scott believed that by his letter to the London Presbytery he not only declined the call to Woolwich but had done with every official tie with the Church of Scotland. He

[1] Letter to the Moderator of the London Presbytery. Cf. Erskine's Letters, vol i. pp. 138–9.

was preparing to give himself up to teaching, when Irving again interfered. "He had," said Scott, "a strength of ecclesiastical, I might say hierarchical, feeling impossible to my convictions."[1] "He conceived that I ought not to anticipate the actual decision of the Church—to assume myself cut off from her communion by an act of my own without her express sentence. In compliance with his desire, I agreed with the Presbytery of London that a reference should be made to the Scottish Presbytery which conferred my licence." The object of this reference to the Presbytery of Paisley and, through it, by appeal to the General Assembly of the Church, was to test the questions whether continuance in office implied that a faith in every article of the Confession remained unshaken and unchanged, and whether such a measure of disagreement with certain doctrines as Mr. Scott had acknowledged was compatible with his being a minister of the Church. When the matter came before the General Assembly the discussion was brief. Professing his willingness to sign the old National Confession of John Knox (a more liberal creed), Mr. Scott was entering on an argument to show that wherein he differed from the Westminster Confession it differed from the Scriptures" when he was rudely interrupted in what Irving described as "one of the most ecclesiastical speeches ever heard within those walls." "My memory of that scene," wrote MacLeod Campbell long afterwards, "remains with me as a memory of the most humble and meekest bearing under much smiting of tongues from men who understood him not." It was the same Assembly that had deposed Campbell two days before; but in it were found six men who spoke more or less favourably on Campbell's side, but not one voice was raised for Scott. Without a dissenting voice the Assembly found "that Mr. Scott, having declared that he did not

[1] Letter to the *Daily News*.

believe the whole doctrine of the Confession of Faith, be deprived of his licence as a preacher of the Gospel," and prohibited all ministers from employing him to preach in their churches.

Campbell and Scott, as we have seen, held substantially the same views. Campbell made a noble and earnest effort to persuade the Assembly that the doctrines which he preached were not absolutely inconsistent with the Confession truly regarded. Scott made no such effort. He did not try to tone down or explain away differences. He saw the inconsistency too clearly. The two men were present each at the other's trial. When Scott's case closed—and after they had been both thrust outside the walls of their national Zion—they walked home together. "After that dreary night in the Assembly," Scott wrote to a friend, "the dawn breaking upon us as we returned at length, alike condemned, to our lodging in the New Town of Edinburgh, I turned round and looked upon my companion's face under the pale light, and asked him, 'Could you sign the Confession now?' His answer was, 'No. The Assembly was right; our doctrine and the Confession are incompatible.'"[1]

Mrs. Oliphant, in the first edition of her life of Edward Irving, chose to represent Scott as a man with a powerful but fastidious mind. She also described the pleading of his own cause before the Assembly, which he did most reluctantly, chiefly to satisfy Irving and his friends, as chivalric perversity and brilliant knight-errantry. Her words drew forth such earnest rebuke and correction in the pages of the *Spectator* and the *Saturday Review* from men whose competence to judge was acknowledged by all, that the misrepresentation was withdrawn from the next

[1] Cf. *Erskine's Letters*, vol. i. p. 139 *et seq.* The substance of the paragraph is taken from this source.

edition of her book. As soon as Scott was convinced that the Gospel he preached could not be reconciled with the formularies of the Kirk he declined the ordination which he had once sought. It was this devotion to truth which Mrs. Oliphant several times characterised as fastidiousness. If it be fastidiousness it is a kind of which we want more, not less. Because he sought to bring the creed of his Church to the text of Scripture she charged him with "chivalric perversity and knight errantry!" If that be knight errantry may we have more of it. If that be chivalry it is the Christian chivalry by which the Christian Church was founded and by which from age to age it renews its life. That Scott was right in his doctrine, in proof of which he appealed to Scripture, is evident, for it is the truth which every intelligent and spiritually-minded minister in the Church of Scotland to-day—notwithstanding the Confession—delights to proclaim. How much his noble appeal may have helped the progress of truth, who shall tell? I venture to think that the religious teachers who at any cost to themselves will bring the words of men to the highest test are the essentially practical men of their generation and the true promoters of the only peace in religious communities that is sound and lasting.

Though deprived of his licence and forbidden to preach in the pulpits of the Church of Scotland, Scott still made Woolwich his home. Here he gathered a little company of thoughtful and earnest people around him in an upper room, and opened a ministry which as truly deserved the name of catholic and apostolic as other recognised ministries at the time in England.

JOHN HUNTER.

(To be concluded.)

THE ORIGIN OF CHRISTIANITY IN THE LIGHT OF MODERN CRITICISM.

THE publication of the first volume of the *Beginnings of Christianity*, under the joint editorship of Foakes-Jackson and Kirsopp Lake, with the co-operation of several other distinguished American and British scholars, is a clear indication that the most radical—not to say destructive—form of New Testament criticism has taken root on English soil. Neither the method adopted by the Editors in their book nor the conclusions reached by them are novel in themselves, for the historico-critical method has been at work now for several decades, and many of the results which are here formulated have been anticipated by German scholars such as Bruno Bauer, Volkmar, Wrede, Bousset and Schmiedel. But never before has a group of British scholars propounded such an extreme position with such a display of scholarship and such dogmatic assurance.

The book is nothing less than a challenge to the interpretation of Christianity which is commonly accepted in our Churches, and it is a challenge which must not be allowed to go by default. The conception of religion involved in the new theory may call itself by the same name as the religion of the New Testament and the religion of the Churches, but it is not the same thing at all. If this book is right, then the Churches are all wrong, and not only their theology and apologetics, but the very faith itself will have to be remodelled to meet the new situation created by the findings of modern criticism.

I

The fundamental thesis developed in the book may be stated as follows in its own words: "The claim of Christianity to be 'a faith once delivered to the saints' cannot bear the scrutiny of the historian of religions. To him it appears not a single religion but a complex of many, justified in claiming the name of Christianity by reason of the thread of historic continuity which runs through and connects its component parts" (p. 265). More particularly it was "a synthesis between Judaism and the Graeco-Oriental thought of the Empire" (266).

Now every sane student of the history of Christianity, since the days of Edwin Hatch, has been prepared to admit that the original organism of the Christian Faith was affected, and in some ways modified, by the action of the environment under the influence of which its early life developed. That to-day is an accepted fact which is regarded as axiomatic. The real issue at stake is: How much in Christianity is due to the natural development of the original organism and how much to the involution of extraneous influences? How much of it is the original foundation laid by Jesus Himself and how much is a superstructure built on to it by alien hands? In other words, "What did Jesus give and what did the Church, under the pressure of foreign ideas, add to the original deposit?"

The chief characteristic of the latest attempt to reconstruct the history of early Christianity is that it reduces to a minimum the original deposit or datum which came from Jesus Himself and increases to a maximum the contribution from other sources which fostered the development of the new religion. The result is that many of the most precious and vital elements in the Christian Faith are entirely eliminated from the deposit left by Jesus, and are regarded as additions which were grafted on to the

original stock through the influence of the Greek Cults.

What then is the rôle assigned to Jesus in the formation of Christianity? And what interpretation is placed upon His life and work?

It will make the answer to this question more lucid if we begin by saying what in the view of the new reconstruction Jesus *was not.* If we ask the question "In what category is Jesus placed by this radical type of criticism?" it is quite clear what the answer is. His life and work are construed in purely human categories. The superhuman categories which are employed in the synoptic Gospels—the Messiah, the Son of Man, the Son of God—are discussed one by one and discarded as the afterthoughts of the Church rather than the expression of the primitive faith of the first disciples. Following in the steps of Bruno Bauer, Volkmar, and Wrede, and refusing to heed the protests of Schmiedel, Bousset, and Schweitzer, the Editors maintain that the Messianic interpretation of Jesus does not represent the judgment of contemporary opinion, but is an accretion added to the story by the Church after the Resurrection. It is impossible, of course, for them to strike out all the passages in Mark in which the word "Christ" occurs. Peter's confession at Cæsarea Philippi is a serious difficulty. The explanation offered is that the word Χριστός is a term with many meanings, and that it is often used vaguely without any real Messianic significance in the technical sense of the term. "If he accepted Peter's confession," say the Editors (p. 396), "he did so either in the sense that he was the Son of Man or in the sense of one "consecrated" to suffering rather than as the Davidic king." Elsewhere, however, they express themselves with more hesitation (for consistency is not one of the strong points of the book). Speaking of the identification of Jesus with the Davidic Messiah, they write, "This was the belief of the desciples: it may

have been, but probably was not, the belief of Jesus: it was not part of His "Gospel," though it was the centre of theirs" (p. 283). But there is little comfort to be gained from the suggestion of the first quotation that Jesus may possibly have used or accepted the title Messiah in the sense of "Son of Man," because, when we turn to the discussion of the latter phrase, we find the gravest doubt thrown upon the possibility that Jesus ever used this phrase to describe Himself at all. "It is somewhat more likely than not," says Lake in his Haskell lectures on *Landmarks of Early Christianity* (which are a popular exposition of the theory worked out in the larger book), "that the identification of Jesus with the Son of Man was not made by Jesus Himself." There seems, therefore, to be nothing in the use of such categories as "Messiah" and "the Son of Man" in the Gospels to suggest that there was anything suprahuman in the consciousness of Jesus with regard to His own person and vocation, though after His death these categories, through a serious misinterpretation, suggested the lines on which the subsequent Christology was developed. Fifty years or so ago Max Müller propounded the theory that mythology originated in "the disease of language"; the Editors seem to come perilously near suggesting that Christian Theology arose from a similar cause. For, on their own showing, it was a complete misapprehension of the meaning and usage of the terms "Messiah," and "Son of Man" on the lips of Jesus which formed the basis of the Christological development in the Apostolic Age.

But, asks Lake, "How do we endanger the future of Christianity by doubting that Jesus identified Himself with figures central in incredible and now almost abandoned forms of thought?" It is not the loss of the terms that forms the burden of our complaint; it is the loss of the thing that the terms stood for that matters. These categories

are, of course, antiquated and out-of-date ; their exact connotation is uncertain ; it is almost impossible to re-mint them into the current coin of modern speech. But whatever may have been their exact meaning, they undoubtedly stood for a differentia which separated Jesus from the rest of the human race and set Him upon the moral throne of the universe. We should raise no objection to the loss of these indeterminate categories if the critics would permit the *Ding an sich*—the underlying substance of their meaning—to remain unimpaired. But that is just what they constantly refuse to do. They are equally drastic when they deal with the term "Son of God" and the passages in the Gospels which are usually quoted to prove that in the mind of Jesus there was a consciousness of a unique relationship between Himself and God. The great *locus classicus* in Matthew xi. 27, "No man knoweth the Son save the Father, neither doth any know the Father save the Son," in spite of the fact that it has more right to be regarded as an excerpt from Q than almost any other text in the Gospels, is cavalierly dismissed because "it clearly employs language which resembles the Johannine and later Christian usage and is quite different from anything else in Mark and Q." Moreover, "it is very improbable that it is an accurate representation of the mind of Jesus, or of the earliest Christian thought, for nowhere else in the earliest strata does Jesus appear as revealing God to those who are ignorant of Him, nor was that the message of the disciples to the Jews" (p. 396). Other passages are dismissed with equal peremptoriness, or explained away on the supposition that the idea of sonship is used in an ordinary human sense.

Equally emphatic too is the book in rejecting the idea upon which Moffatt lays such stress in his *Theology of the Gospels*—that Jesus assumed the rôle of the "suffering servant" of Isaiah and claimed to fulfil the functions of this

Old Testament ideal. There is absolutely no shred of evidence, therefore, left to connect even the most rudimentary germs of the evangelical conception of Christianity with the person or teaching of its Founder. The evangelical note came into the faith from the Greek Cults, and was in no sense due in the very least degree to anything that Jesus ever said or did.

Nor does the theory allow that even the term κύριος was ever applied to Jesus in the primitive days of Christianity. Like Professor Morgan in his book on *The Religion and Theology of St. Paul*, the Editors maintain that this title was introduced into Christianity from the Greek Cults. "The title κύριος," they say, "marks the last stage in the synthesis between the Jewish elements in Christianity and the fundamental idea of the Graeco-Oriental religions" (p. 417).

The only title for Jesus during the course of His public ministry that the Editors of this book will allow is διδάσκαλος, which, they assert, was certainly the "primitive appellation" by which He was called (p. 495). This title was afterwards transposed even in the Gospel narrative into a higher category through the influence of the development of the Christological idea.

Thus, as we have seen, all the categories which are used to indicate that Jesus was something more than human are excised by the knife of the new criticism, and we are left with a purely human figure who belongs to the rank of the prophets. The amount of Christology traceable in the Gospels is therefore reduced, as Lake himself admits, "to a vanishing point." (*Landmarks*, p. 59.)

It is therefore as a divinely inspired prophet that Jesus is interpreted in this latest exposition of the origin of Christianity. And the question now arises, "Of what did His prophetic work consist? What was there in His teach-

ing to differentiate Him from other men of the same order? What new note did He strike and what fresh truth did He reveal?" The answer which the book gives to these questions is a further illustration of the attempt which is being made to reduce to a minimum the contribution of Jesus to the religion which bears His name. It is not too much to say that in no school of thought which recognises the existence of Jesus at all is the part assigned to Him in the foundation of Christianity so meagre and diminutive. In the first place, the teaching of Jesus contains no new revelation at all about the nature of God. "The God of Jesus is the God of the Jews about whom He says nothing that cannot be paralleled in Jewish Literature" (286), a statement which is reaffirmed on p. 402: "The God of Jesus and of His disciples is identical with the God of the Jews; His message was not the announcement that God was a Father or King—that was assumed as part of the common belief of Israel" Nor was there anything new in the conception of the Kingdom which Jesus proclaimed. "It is clear," says Lake, "that there was not any essential difference between Jesus and His contemporaries as to either the meaning of the kingdom of God or the necessity and power of repentance." (*Landmarks*, p. 29.)

What then is the secret of the power of the teaching of Jesus? Speaking broadly, it lies in a new conception "of the kind of conduct which was necessary for membership in the Kingdom of God and prescribed for repentance" (p. 29). Now at last we are getting to the heart of the subject, and negations which bulk so largely in the book are yielding to positive statement. The essence of primitive Christianity lies therefore in the ethical teaching of Jesus—in His new ideal of life and His new standards of conduct. And what are these? The new principles which Jesus introduced into ethics are threefold: (1) the doctrine of

non-resistance to oppression. Jesus challenged the policy of the war party in Palestine, the "fourth philosophy" as Josephus describes them (or the Zealots, to give them the name by which they are more commonly known, though the Editors may be right in their statement that this name was of later origin), and adopted the attitude of modern pacifism. Whether our Editors are right in putting this construction on the words of Jesus may, perhaps, be open to question, but one thing is quite certain—if their interpretation of the teaching of Jesus is sound—His position on this point cannot in any true sense of the word be described as new. One of the most assured results of the study of the intermediate period between the Old and New Testaments is that there was a well-defined "pacifist school" in Palestine at the time of Christ. They are generally known as the Quietists, and their views are expounded in the *Assumption of Moses*, *the Fourth Book of Maccabees*, and to a lesser degree in the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*. All that can be said, therefore, is that Jesus identified Himself with the aims and principles of this party. Moreover, Lake argues that the teaching of Jesus upon this point was misguided and based upon a false conception of God. "The Jew believed not merely in an omnipotent God, but in a God who constantly used His power independently of the action of men. We, on the contrary, believe that the universe is so constituted that . . . what men do or do not bears a definite relation to the events which will follow, and we no longer look for God to help those who are unwilling to help themselves." (*Landmarks*, p. 34.) This element, therefore, is due "to the human limitations of the ethics of Jesus by the intellectual horizon of His own time" (p. 35). (2) The second point is one about which less disagreement is likely. Jesus exhibited a new attitude to the common people, who had practically been ostracised by the religious leaders of the nation, and

opened to them the doors of the Kingdom of Heaven. But even here the statement does not seem to mean very much. The attitude of Jesus to the people differed "in practice rather than in principle" from that of the scribes and Pharisees (p. 291). But if there was no difference of "principle," what is really involved in this claim that is made for Jesus? Does it mean anything more than that Jesus was devoid of that social aversion to the lower classes which was characteristic of His contemporaries and which found its most honest expression in the words of the Roman poet, "*Odi profanum vulgus et arceo*"? Can we say anything more about it than that the sneer of the Pharisees at "this people that knoweth not the law" and the sentiment expressed by Quintilian in a letter to a friend, "Can you so far demean yourself that the poor will not be intolerable to you?" were absolutely foreign to the spirit of Jesus? Is it not a difference of temperament and sympathy rather than a difference that goes to the heart of things? (3) Jesus gave a new and more spiritual interpretation to the law by laying the stress on the spirit rather than the letter of its enactments. No one can read the Gospels without feeling the force of this position, and most readers will feel it far more acutely than the writers of this book. For the position is qualified by statements which appear elsewhere on its pages. For instance, Lake (*Landmarks*, pp. 28–29), quotes from Montefiore the beautiful story of the repentance of Rabbi Eliezer ben Durdaiya to prove "that the best Rabbinical and the best Christian teaching on repentance were identical as to its nature and efficacy."

As the net result of this discussion, the figure of Jesus seems to emerge as a Jewish Rabbi or prophet, a greater Hillel or Akiba, gifted with a deep insight into the meaning and interpretation of the Law, possessing a unique sympathy for the poor and the outcast, and holding some misguided

notions of pacifism based upon a complete misapprehension of God and the mode of the Divine Action.

Such, according to the theory, is the germ out of which the Christian Faith was developed. It is clear that all the great characteristic features of later Christianity came not from its Founder, but from other sources. What was afterwards known as "the faith once delivered to the saints" contained very little that was not the natural product either of Judaism or the Greek Cults. The transformation of the prophet of Galilee into a Divine Figure and a Redeemer took place after His death, and was the work of the primitive disciples in Jerusalem, and the Gentile Churches in Antioch, Corinth, and Ephesus.

II

A complete examination of this theory would involve a detailed investigation of the critical presuppositions on which it is based. Such an enquiry cannot be attempted in the present article. We must leave out of account for the moment the discussion of the issue as to whether the principles and method which have been employed by the Editors of the book in the use they make of the evidence in the documentary sources are sound and scientific, or whether a fair and consistent treatment of the data supplied in Mark and Q would not have led us to different conclusions.

Upon this point only two remarks can be made now. It is very noticeable that the negative conclusions of the book are most of them stated with some hesitation and doubt. In passages already quoted, such phrases as the following occur. The identification of Jesus with the Davidic Messiah "*may have been*, but *probably was not* the belief of Jesus." "It is *somewhat more likely than not* that the identification of Jesus with the Son of Man was not made by Jesus Himself." It is obvious, therefore, that the

writers themselves recognise that their negative conclusions rest merely on a balance of critical probabilities, and that their verdict is incapable of complete demonstration. The chain of their argument contains, on their own confession, many weak links, and if one of these links were to snap, it would be broken beyond repair. The foundations on which the theory rests are laid on the shifting sand of doubtful hypothesis, and not on the solid rock of ascertained fact. And yet when the theory has been formulated there is a dogmatic assurance about the statement of it which is out of all relation to the instability and precariousness of the arguments on which it is founded.

One other point must be mentioned before we turn to the more fundamental form of criticism. The writers assume that the differentia which separated the teaching of Jesus from the best Jewish thought of his time is very slight and thin. That, however, does not seem to have been the opinion of Jesus Himself if we are to trust our documents. He told the people most emphatically that His message was not a "new patch" which could be sewn on to an old garment, and that the "new wine" of His Gospel could not be poured into the "old bottles" without completely destroying them. Surely this remark would not have been true if the "three points" which the writers regard as constituting the substance of His contribution to the Judaism of His time had contained the essence of His teaching. But there is a more striking saying still. In words that are quoted by both Matthew and Luke, and may therefore be assumed to have come from Q, Jesus draws an absolute line of cleavage between the era that preceded and the era that followed the establishment of the Kingdom. "Verily I say unto you, there hath not arisen among them that are born of women a greater than John the Baptist; yet he that is but little in the Kingdom of Heaven is greater than

he" (Luke vii. 28, Matt. xi. 11). Words such as these surely imply that there is a radical difference between the old and the new, and that this radical difference is due to the coming of the Kingdom which He Himself has established.

We may now turn to a more important question. The theory of the book is that Christianity originated in a "synthesis between Judaism and Græco-Oriental thought." Now it is quite certain that the particular phase of Judaism connected with the name of Jesus was not the only type which was brought into contact with "Græco-Oriental thought." There are many such combinations. We find a similar union, for instance, in such books as *Wisdom* and *IV. Maccabees*. There is evidence that the teaching of John the Baptist was transplanted into Asia Minor, where it had the same chances of marriage with Greek Thought as the Gospel of Jesus. Above all, there is the crowning illustration of Philo at Alexandria. If the *vera causa* in the production of Christianity was the fusion of Judaism and Græco-Oriental thought, why was it that Philo did not become the founder of the new religion? Philo had many advantages over Jesus. He lived in a city where the two great streams—which at their meeting were to create the new faith—had mingled their waters for some centuries: Jesus was isolated in Palestine and had no opportunity of guiding the Jewish faith in the direction of Hellenism at all. Philo was himself a master in the knowledge of both forms of thought, and was as much at home in the one as in the other. Jesus never shows us that He possessed any intimacy with the work of Greek thought at all. In the mind of Philo a way of reconciling the two forms of faith had already been found. Jesus never seems to have faced the problem in the least degree. Why was it that Philo failed in the great project upon which he had set his heart? Why was it that the form of synthesis which he produced was powerless

to create a new religion? And why was it that it was only the type of Judaism which had been impregnated with the teaching of Jesus that, on the implications of this theory, was successful in producing Christianity? The same factors existed in the case of Jesus, and Philo and the other teachers who were striving to wed the soul of Judaism to the spirit of Greek Thought. Yet in every other instance the union was infertile and produced no result. We are left, therefore, with the problem—How was Jesus able to transform the Jewish religion in such a way that by coming into contact with Græco-Oriental thought it was able to produce the Christian Faith and the Christian Church, while no other type of Judaism which had been untouched by His influence was able to effect through such a union any important result at all? The "three points" are entirely inadequate as an explanation of this remarkable phenomenon —for the three "points" are never very conspicuous in the history of the Apostolic Age.

But there is a greater difficulty still which the theory will inevitably have to face, compared with which all other questions sink into insignificance. The more we minimise the Divine elements in the person and work of the historical Jesus and reduce the contribution in His teaching to "three points," the greater becomes the problem of explaining His subsequent apotheosis. Granted that all the necessary categories and theological formulæ were lying ready to hand in the storehouse of the Jewish Greek and Oriental religious cults of the time—that the whole Christological outfit was waiting in the wardrobe of current thought, for someone to wear—that terms like Messiah, Son of Man, Lord, and Logos were at the disposal of any theologian who cared to use them—why was it that Jesus was selected for the honour and dignity of deification? Why was it that all these crowns were placed upon His brow? Why was it

that He and He alone was chosen to bear the highest categories that were available at His time ?

Schleiermacher passed a very severe yet a very pertinent criticism upon the negative theories of his day. " How a Jewish Rabbi," he says, " of philanthropic mind and somewhat Socratic morals, with a few miracles, or at least what others took for such, and the ability to utter some clever parables—how one who was this and nothing more, and who, were He only this, were not fit to stand before Moses or Mohammed—could have caused such an effect as a new religion and Church—to be able to conceive how this were possible one must first take leave of his senses." Schleiermacher's stricture, in the main, applies to the new theory. What was there in Jesus, which there was not in John the Baptist, or Akiba, or Philo, or Seneca—that He should have been crowned by the early centuries as " Lord of all " ? It is useless to cite as parallels the deification of the Roman Emperors, or the worship of the Greek Cults. Jesus was not an emperor or a mythological hero, but simply, if we are to accept the position of Foakes-Jackson and Lake, a Jewish prophet or Rabbi with little that was new or distinctive in His teaching. Moreover, there was much connected with His person and career that seemed to make against His apotheosis. Is it likely, for instance, that the Greek world would have chosen a Jew as the central figure in a new cult ? Was it easy for Jews, with their passionate devotion to monotheism, to endow Jesus with the attributes of Deity ? And if there were no other reason against it, would not the shameful death upon the Cross have made it impossible ? As it was, the Church had to triumph over the taunt that was so often levelled against it : " Cursed is everyone that hangeth upon the tree." There is absolutely no road along which admiration for one who was merely a Jewish prophet can pass into the tran-

scendent faith involved in the Logos doctrine of the Fourth Gospel.

There must therefore have been something about Jesus other than the "three points" to explain even the first step taken by the early disciples in Jerusalem, when they hailed Jesus as Messiah. The book apparently finds the justification for the transformation in the Resurrection of Jesus. There are some five or six references to the Resurrection in the book, but the writers never tell us what they understand by it. And yet if the whole of the *onus probandi* is to be laid upon the Resurrection, we ought to have had something more than the few indeterminate allusions to that event that the book contains. The writers, for instance, speak of "the vision of the risen Christ in Galilee" (p. 302). A phrase such as this compels us to ask the question: What amount of objective fact was there in this "vision"? The matter is of paramount importance. The issue at stake is nothing less than this: Was there enough objective reality in the experience of the resurrection by the disciples to justify them in transforming the prophet of the "three points" into the Messiah? Now, one of the Editors of the book—Dr. Lake—has already published a *brochure* on the Resurrection, in which he ranks himself among those "who regard the Resurrection of Christ not as the resurrection of a material body, but as the manifestation of a surviving personality," and sums up his discussion by saying: "It means that we have to consider the possibility that the phenomenon which we call the 'Resurrection of Christ' cannot be isolated, but must be considered in connexion with others which belong to the same class." And then he adds the ominous words: "At this point the psychologist comes into the discussion and says that such appearances are not isolated phenomena; but he is not quite ready to say what explanation he wishes to give of them. Perhaps

they are proofs that personality survives death in a form which does not exclude the possibility of communications. Perhaps they are proofs of as yet unfathomed possibilities of the influence of living personality and unconscious thought which suddenly reaches the plane of consciousness and manifests itself there in the form of "appearances" and "messages." (*The Resurrection of Jesus Christ*, pp. 275–276.) Now, unless Lake has abandoned his earlier position (and there is no indication of it), it is difficult to see how on such an interpretation the Resurrection is a sufficient justification for placing the crown of the Messiahship upon the head of Jesus. For if the Resurrection is not an "isolated phenomenon," but is analogous to other appearances which modern Psychical Research declares to have been equally real, why should the Jewish prophet alone, who only did what (as it is claimed) many others have done, have been deemed worthy of worship on that account? But, apparently, we cannot be sure of even this amount of reality about the Resurrection. Psychology has not yet spoken its last word, and in the future may be able to find a perfectly natural explanation of these phenomena. So that if Christianity in the ultimate result rests upon a psychical fact which is at present unexplained but may possibly some day yield to a perfectly natural explanation, it is built up upon a very flimsy and insecure foundation.

But whatever be the inner reality of the Resurrection experience of the disciples, it is quite certain, according to Lake, that the mode in which that experience presented itself was due to the subjective condition of their own minds. "The form in which the spiritual being presented itself was due, not to His own nature, but to that of the disciples" (p. 271). That surely implies that there was a subjective preparation in the recipients, a preparation which cannot be found in the "three points." The best com-

mentary upon this theory is to be found in the words of Bousset: "It is quite conceivable that the first disciples of Jesus, who by His death and burial had seen all their hopes shattered and their belief in His Messiahship destroyed, might have *returned* to that belief under the influence of their Resurrection experiences, if they had formerly possessed it, on the ground of the utterances and general conduct of Jesus. But it would be wholly incomprehensible that that belief should have *originated* in their hearts after the catastrophe, for in that case we must assume that those marvellous experiences of the Easter days produced something completely new in the disciples' souls by a process of sheer magic and without any psychological preparation." (*Jesus*, p. 169.)

Are Foakes-Jackson and Lake prepared to admit the force of Bousset's contention that the Resurrection experience of the disciples was a *deus ex machinâ* which produced "something new in their souls by a process of sheer magic and without any psychological explanation"? If not, their whole position crumbles away, for it is only some such explanation as this that can bridge the gulf between the prophet of the "three points" and the Christian Messiah.

H. T. Andrews.

THE SEQUEL TO JOB.

The Christian Other Alternative.

The Book of Job in its passion and in the sweep of its imaginative power stands among the poems of the world as the marbles of Athens among its works of art. Within its own range of material it is perfect and entire. The imagination never falters; the pitch of inspiration is never lowered; but this poet, in common with all poets,

is limited by his material; he cannot go beyond his vision, and he never goes where he is not sent. He carries the reader a part of the way, and then he must leave him. When he reaches a certain point in the journey, the spiritual guide has to commit the traveller to other hands. But into whose hands?

The poem is in the spiritual revelation a beginning; it is a preparatory essay in the understanding of life; it is more an enquiry than an answer. This will appear a trifle in the eyes of readers who demand only beauty of form from the poet, and care little for his theme, whether it be true or false, complete or incomplete. But no Hebrew seer would have consented to such a standard, and praise of this kind would have seemed to him reproach. To him truth was the one concern, and the only purpose of poetry or of any art was to show forth the realities of God in His ways with men. We may be sure that the poet himself knew that there must be a sequel to his poem. His inspired imagination had played upon certain phases of a problem, but not upon all. It was not given to him to see more than a limited range; we have heard of the patience of Job, but we must not forget the patience of the poet who created him; and that patience must lie in the refusal to treat the imperfect as though it were perfect, or to rest in traditional answers to facts, now forcing themselves upon the mind in new and startling ways. Of no book can it be claimed with more assurance that it is inspired; but it is inspired not because it solves for man the mystery of suffering, but because it faces the spiritual facts with the courage and patience of faith; not that it closes questions, but that it opens them in such a way, that the thinker is advanced nearer to an answer. There are ways of stating problems which are in themselves half answers. The Book of Job does this for man; it rules out certain false interpretations,

and provides the seeker with guidance to the verge of an inner land where Another waits him.

The sequel is not to be found in the Old Testament; it is in no poem, but in the act of the Cross, and in the glory of the Resurrection. The answer to Job is not given from the whirlwind but from the Crucified. The author of the poem never heard that answer; it was his task to prepare the children of men for a healing and a peace, which he was never to know. He made Israel ready for a mystery which neither he nor his generation lived to see. By the very sincerity and passion of his soul he left to others riches into which he might never enter; for his book is an avenue which leads to the Cross.

The poem tells how Job challenged the darkness; how he went open-eyed into the stage of doubt and terror between the old interpretation of suffering, no longer conceivable to the nobler spirits in Israel, and a new not yet given. Tradition had taught him that his sufferings were the penalty for his sin; the dogma had broken down; whatever else might be true, and even if no other light were given, Job was certain that the traditional thesis which linked sufferings always with sin had failed; it had broken down where all imperfect solutions break down, before experience. Job stood by his experience against the tradition of his day; better the outer darkness than unreality! But this very breaking away from old securities marked an advance towards the Cross.

For the poet whose own mind is discharged through the words of Job, life was no trivial concern in which it did not matter greatly what was said so long as it was said beautifully. He took truth seriously; he was jealous for the honour of God; most of all did he dread losing God. So the tides of this spiritual battle rolled between Job and his friends. Job often desperate and near to blasphemy, his

friends in poetry, no less wonderful, approving reverently the order of the world as they knew it. Job is justified in the end; but the battle does not close in any complete victory. Truths are thrown out; guesses, daring claims, sighs are heard; but there is no final and satisfying answer to the problem; what then is the meaning of the woes which fall on the innocent?"

At the last a voice is heard from the whirlwind, and God speaks. But His words are almost like a fragment from another work. The Almighty treats the suffering patriarch with playful irony. His words are strangely beautiful, but, as it seems, irrelevant. Picture after picture of the majesty and variety of all created things is passed before Job. Over against man's limited vision there is revealed the wealth and immensity of his Divine Lord. Glorious irrelevances they appear to be: it is almost as though a poet were to chant the excellences and the diversions of the divine artist to a soldier dying on the battlefield. How will it help Job to hear the wonders of leviathan or behemoth, as he lurks beneath his lotus tree? What have these things to do with a life wrecked without mercy?

It is true that the sufferer may learn how vast a family God has beneath His care; it is something not to claim preference in such a manifold world; true he learns from many an aside how watchful and tender a Creator God must be—He who causes the rain to fall where no man is; better still, Job may come to that humility which befits man with his limited vision as he stands before the Eternal Wisdom. *God is in Heaven, thou upon earth; therefore let thy words be few.* There is but one place for the soul of man; it is to be infinitely low at the feet of God. This at least is in the covenant of the human spirit. The sufferer is left in the last scene but one

> "consumed yet quicken'd by the glance of God."

He abhors himself in dust and ashes.

The last scene shows the patriarch restored to a prosperity even greater than in his former days. But this ending does not touch the heart of the poem as we must read it to-day. There is in this close perhaps the daring leap of faith above the intervening stages. But strangely beautiful as it is to read the calm close, for the modern reader the poem ends with Job humbled at the feet of the Great and Wonderful God—"I had heard of Thee with the hearing of the ear, but now mine eye seeth Thee." Job is humbled and patient; but still his problem is unsolved. The reader seems to wait for something to follow. And then suddenly the piece finishes. But it is taken up again; and the strains for which the ear waits can be heard from another voice, and from another scene.

Certainly there must be a fuller answer. The Vindicator upon this earth must reveal another meaning in such suffering as that of Job. God had spoken; that was an interim answer; even though His words did not deal with the case of Job. He had not kept silence; the words of the Almighty are not meant to be an answer, but His voice itself brings comfort and patience. The real answer could only be in deeds. Man can never be content to rest in any report heard with the hearing of the ear; he must see God for himself. *God must not only send, He must come; He must not only speak from the whirlwind, He must act.*

When it is said that the Cross is the sequel to Job, it cannot be meant that since Christ died, the intellectual mystery has been solved. It is not in the endurance of the intellectual uncertainty that the heaviest burden rests upon man. It is a problem in the moral and spiritual policy of life; it is not so much our question, how are we thinking of suffering, but how are we to act in the hour of suffering, how are we to handle it? And it is here that there comes a radiant truth upon our path from the Crucified. The

Cross, as it speaks of forgiveness and mercy to the uttermost, can never be forgotten. If the Cross is not the release of redemption, it is nothing. But here we are concerned with another meaning—a meaning derived from the prior message of the Cross. That act of God means mercy and peace, and with that message it brings the offer of *a new alternative for all who suffer*. It is not so much an alternative theory as an alternative way of handling suffering. This too may have been dimly seen by the author of *Job*, but it was never revealed in its fulness till men began to "suffer with Christ."

Christ suffered for our sins, the just for the unjust, that He might bring us to God. Christ the innocent sufferer so endured His suffering that He set up in the world a measureless blessing because of His death. The counter-good outvalued all the evil. Sin abounded; but grace much more abounded in the Cross. They therefore who suffer with Christ may learn a method from Him. They do not repeat His death; but they learn to show in their own degree the secret of that Death, so far as it was the encounter of the innocent with the pains and woes of the world.

The Christian Job might know all the agonies of the patriarch. What difference would his union with Christ make? The antecedents of his suffering might be as much a mystery as ever. It is no clearer than it was in that earlier time why he and not others should be called to bear the brunt of the world's pain. But what is to follow from the trial? Can it be so endured that it may become a spring of healing and power to others? For the Christian Job the interest lies in suffering not as an end, but as a beginning. Since Christ died, every cross becomes a new opening for the Spirit of God into this human scene. So the Christian sufferer can grasp, even in the hour of his deepest pain, "the far-off interest of tears."

It is possible still to handle suffering in a spirit of

resentment. "Why should it fall on me?" The question is often heard in the Old Testament from troubled saints; but it is not heard in the New Testament on the lips of those who have been with Jesus. There is no resentment in the bearing of His disciples. Or suffering may be met in the spirit of unquestioning resignation; as though Job said, "I must let the waves of agony sweep over me, and I must not repine." This is beyond doubt a part of the Christian attitude; but it is not the last truth or the distinctive truth of the Christian life in this matter. The Christian Job is no stoic. There is yet another way. It is learned from Christ, who indeed went to death as a lamb to the slaughter, but at the same time turned the hours of agony into an endless good for all mankind; who so treated the Cross that in the thought of its sequel we can say, "Father, take not that cup away." Jesus took the field Himself; He turned the attack upon Himself into a victory; He made the Cross, which was a mere gallows, into a scene of triumph. The world was richer because of all that He suffered. Therefore every one who endures with Christ may look to that which follows and work for it: and so by faith may turn every defeat into victory, and make every mystery a radiant light to the world.

The story of Adèle Kamm, the Swiss girl, who died in her youth from a most painful form of tuberculosis, shows precisely the distinctively Christian way of handling suffering. Her life, by M. Paul Seippel, translated into English under the title *A Living Witness*,[1] is a story of suffering so treated that it became a spring of joy to all who came near to her, and now to all who read her story. She might have resented the fate which laid her low in her bright youth. She might have been merely passive. But she did something more rare and wonderful. She made her loss a

[1] Hodder & Stoughton.

priceless gem to others who were going the same way of the Cross with her; she bound them together into a society pledged to help each other; she made her sick-room a place to which her friends came not to bring comfort, but to receive joy and cheer. She wrote letters to the prisoners in a neighbouring prison, which she could see through her window—she, a prisoner, tried to comfort the other prisoners. In such a spirit she even found it in her heart to thank God for her pains. "I believe," she said, "that suffering, accepted with submission, may be a means of great blessing to us; but I also believe that we may go a step further, and that by the voluntary acceptance of our cross in the Spirit of Christ (that is in union with the Will of God) we may help, in some measure, to bring about the final victory of good over evil." Such is always the distinctively Christian attitude. This is the insight which the Christian Job may have; and because of it he may know always the experience of one who sorrows yet always rejoices; in the world he has tribulation, but in Christ He has overcome the world.

There is no note in the Book of Job which does not waken a response in the human heart still. Man will never cease to read it so long as he is called to pass into the darkness; there is no greater poet than this brave heart; but in the bearing of the soul towards life the least in the kingdom of God, through the grace of Christ, is greater than he.

EDWARD SHILLITO.

"NOT INTO TEMPTATION . . ."

CONCERNING these words much has been written, for the sentence in which they stand has ever been accounted the most difficult of the Lord's Prayer. But the point of diffi-

culty has shifted within modern times, so that of the newer problem there is still, perhaps, something to be said. The explanations which the most of the commentators supply leave us ill content. True, neither the child at a mother's knee nor the aged cottager repeating the Prayer will stray far from the essential meaning. Each, at least, knows temptation; each asks to be delivered from its evil. Rightly, however, we desire more than a general idea of the significance which the sentence possesses. The more closely we examine the Prayer, the more spiritually vital it becomes, the more our eyes are opened to the wealth of teaching beneath the simplicity of phrase. To return again and again to a minute study of the Prayer is much more than an intellectual exercise; it is to understand better the Master's mind, and so to use the words He taught with a devotion heightened by understanding.

Of the older and more familiar difficulty little need be said here. But it seems to have been felt from the early days of the Christian Church. "Are we to believe," men asked, "that God leads us into temptation? If so,

> O Thou, who didst with pitfall and with gin
> Beset the Road I was to wander in,
> Thou wilt not with Predestin'd Evil round
> Enmesh, and then impute my Fall to Sin!"

We shrink from the thought—but how else were it needful, as Jesus teaches, to pray of the Father that He will not lead us into temptation?" But the son of Sirach had written: "Say not thou: It is through the Lord that I fell away . . . Say not thou, It is He that caused me to err," and St. James repeated that warning in his own blunt fashion: "Let no man say when he is tempted, I am tempted of God." Was he driven to reinforce the truth because this petition of the Paternoster had been misunderstood already, and false reasonings based upon the

misunderstanding? In later years, at least, we may be sure that the difficulty was increased by the rendering of μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς as "ne nos *inducas*" in Latin, and thence as "*Lead* us not" in English. Those translations ignore the difference between εἰσφέρειν and εἰσάγειν. In the former verb the directive sense is far less strong. This has been recognised by our R.V., and one could wish that its "Bring us not" were adopted in our liturgical use of the Prayer. Yet that change, if it diminished, would not remove the popular difficulty, the difficulty of supposing the words to imply that God might bring man into temptation.

Some of the early glosses—Dr. Chase has shown how very ancient and very widespread they were—point the way towards a right understanding of the words, though it was by an error that they passed from liturgical versions of the Prayer into texts of the Matthaean and Lukan Gospels. Perhaps the most felicitous is that quoted by Augustine: "Many people when using the prayer word this sentence 'Suffer us not to be led into temptation.'" ("Multi precando ita dicunt, Ne nos patiaris induci in temptationem.") Mere gloss though it be, we cannot doubt that this expansion of the original sentence reveals its true meaning. Naturally enough the Greek sentence —probably like the Aramaic it translated—was phrased as concisely as possible, that it might be memorised the more easily, and, for the same reason, a parallelism of form was preserved between it and the petitions which preceded it. Thus μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς ἡμᾶς εἰς πειρασμόν is elliptic in form, but the spirit of the petition it makes is "Suffer us not to be brought into temptation." When thus understood and used, the older difficulty associated with it disappears.

Yet another, and a greater, difficulty survives for the thoughtful disciple of modern days. Recognising that the

words contain no suggestion that we might be "tempted of God," discerning "suffer us not to be brought into temptation" as their true meaning, he is driven yet to ask why we are taught to make this prayer. It seems to ask the impossible, though we are sure that Jesus never bade His disciples to offer petitions which, from their very nature, could not be fulfilled. Not the greatest saint, not our Lord Himself in His earthly life, could be exempt from temptation. A commentator of the older school cites the petition as an instance of our Lord's "idealism." "As He commanded His disciples to be perfect, though knowing that perfection far exceeded their reach, so here He bids them pray for the ideal state, for freedom from all temptation, although in this world the prayer cannot be completely answered." That is a most unsatisfying explanation. It is one thing to propound an ideal standard of human conduct; it is quite another to implore God daily to grant what, in point of fact, we know cannot be granted. Moreover—and here we reach the heart of the difficulty—"freedom from all temptation" would *not* be "the ideal state" for human beings in this world. To desire it would be, speaking bluntly, the height of folly, would be to ignore all that God has revealed concerning moral growth.

For we have learnt no longer to confuse temptation with sin. We see that the potential good of temptation is as real as its potential evil. We understand how fundamental is the law of effort as the condition of all progress. Science has taught us to discern its operation in the physical world, to see struggle crowned by survival in the cosmic evolutionary process. And in the spiritual world also it is he who overcometh that inheriteth. To meet and to master temptation seems to be the one means of strengthening character, so that, did we not meet temptation, we could make no moral progress. For our Lord Himself, being

Man, the rule held. It could only be His conquest over temptation which caused Him, in St. Luke's bold phrase, "to grow in favour with God," and, though the temptation was of the devil, it was by the Spirit that He was led to meet it. Without temptation, then, there could be no moral growth. Perhaps St. James had this truth in his mind when he wrote a sentence which A.V. and R.V. alike have grievously mistranslated. He bade Christians be glad ὅταν πειρασμοῖς περιπέσητε ποικίλοις, which certainly does not mean "when ye fall *into*" manifold temptations, but (literally) "when ye fall (i.e. from tranquil well-being) so as to be *compassed about by* manifold trials." The rendering of the *Twentieth Century New Testament* is fairly adequate: "Whatsoever may be the temptations that beset you from time to time, always regard them as a reason for rejoicing, knowing, as you do, that the resting of your faith develops endurance." But the "trials" of this sentence may be external rather than internal; "afflictions," "persecutions," rather than moral temptations.

Our concern here, however, is with the words: "Bring us not into temptation." To pray that we may escape temptation seems both futile and foolish—futile, because the prayer cannot be granted; foolish, because its granting would be to our hurt. How, therefore, are we to interpret, in what sense are we to use, this sentence of the Paternoster? The answers supplied by commentaries are various, but are alike in being forced, elaborate, and therefore unsatisfying. Often an attempt is made to show that a distinction exists between "normal" and "extra and avoidable" temptations, and this petition is thought to be restricted to the latter. Thus Dr. E. Lyttelton paraphrases it: "May it not become necessary that we be roused from spiritual sloth by being brought into special temptation and so falling into sin." This appears, but doubtless is not intended, to imply

that God will cause us to fall into sin as a remedy for spiritual sloth. Apart from that, the explanation is obviously far too intricate, as are many other suggestions that have been offered. It seems impossible to believe that among the very concise, lucid, and definite petitions of His model Prayer our Lord would have introduced one that could be understood only if its words were understood in an abnormal sense, one that could be made intelligible only by an elaborate and arbitrary paraphrase. And it seems nearly as impossible to disregard the precise wording, as Bishop Gore urges us to do, and "to interpret the prayer more generally as an expression of self-distrust." That it is, no doubt; yet it cannot be merely to express our self-distrust that we are bidden to pray "Bring us not into temptation," especially when we remember that it is only through meeting temptation that we can gain strength. Would our Lord wish self-distrust to be expressed by asking that we may be spared the one experience by means of which spiritual growth is possible?

No; the explanation of these so simple and direct words must itself be simple and direct. It must lie within the words themselves, not in misty implications which may be drawn from them. And such an explanation seems ready to our hand.

The petition is that we may not be brought *into* temptation. That is quite different from a petition that we may not be brought *unto* temptation. As if to mark the point, the pronoun is duplicated: μὴ εἰσενέγκῃς εἰς πειρασμόν. It is true that in late Greek εἰς was given a wide range of meaning, but the evidence of the papyri does nothing to invalidate Thayer-Grimm's statement that, in its metaphorical use, "after verbs of going, coming, leading, etc., it is joined to nouns designating the condition or state into which one passes," as in εἰς τὴν βασιλείαν τοῦ Θεοῦ,

εἰς τὴν ζωήν, εἰς κόλασιν, and many other phrases.[1] To "enter into" the Kingdom of God is much more than to approach the Kingdom of God; it is to yield to its claims, to be dominated by it, to take its law as the law of one's being. And to "enter into" temptation is very different from merely encountering temptation, is to yield to its demands, to be subjugated by it. Our Lord gives us no encouragement to ask that we may not be brought *to* temptation, but bids us pray that we may not enter *into* it. When in Gethsemane he bade His disciples "watch and pray, that ye enter not into temptation," He knew that within a few minutes temptation would confront them —the temptation of cowardice and disloyalty. To beg that they might not be brought to that temptation were futile. But He would have them desire that they might not be brought into it, into its power so as to be mastered by it; they must needs approach its walls, where the battle must be fought, but they need not be led captive into its citadel.

And this view—that the difficulty of the petition disappears when we notice carefully its wording, distinguishing between "to" and "into," and remembering that εἰς, not πρός is the preposition used—seems to be strongly supported by the remainder of the sentence. The use of "but" instead of "and" at its beginning shows that this is not a separate, independent petition; "but deliver us from evil" completes and illuminates the prayer "bring us not into temptation." And again the wording, ἀλλὰ ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς ἀπὸ τοῦ πονηροῦ, should be noticed carefully. The literal meaning of ῥῦσαι ἡμᾶς is "draw us away to Thyself," and the preposition is ἀπό, "from," not ἐκ, "out of." Therefore the force of the whole is not, as some have thought, "Suffer us, so far as

[1] So, of course, πορεύου εἰς εἰρήνην (Lk. vii. 50, etc.) does not mean, as readers of the English translation are apt to suppose, "Depart, and let your mind be at peace," but "enter into the state, or condition, of peace."

possible, not to be led into temptation, but when, through our frailty, we have been so led into it, help us to escape again out of its evil." Rather we ask that, when led to temptation, we may not be led into it, but may be saved from that entrance by the power of God, drawing us back from the evil to Himself. Thus we seem to have reached an interpretation of this sentence in our Lord's Prayer, derived from an attentive study of its actual wording, which is simple, which satisfies, which clears away the difficulties and misunderstandings. No more need we deem ourselves bidden to intercede vainly that temptation may be wholly withheld from us. Satanic as is its source and fearful as are its perils, God's overruling power has utilised it as a means of our schooling in this stage of life. Only by meeting temptation can we follow in our Master's steps, and, conquering through His power, make our characters rise nearer to His ideal. "Lead not into temptation, but deliver us from evil!" Daily we must come to temptation, yet "suffer us not," we ask, as He has taught, "to be brought, not merely to, but into temptation, so that we pass into its heart, its power, its thrall; daily we must be brought to temptation, but reinforce our wills with Thy strength so that we may resist and not be drawn over the threshold into it; daily we must be brought to temptation, but, O God, deliver us from its evil!"

ANTHONY C. DEANE.

THE PURPOSE EXPRESSED IN LUKE'S PREFACE.

THE preface of Luke's gospel on account of its importance has been frequently studied[1] and often with much learning, but there remains in it much that is ambiguous or obscure.

[1] Most recently by G. H. Whitaker in the EXPOSITOR for October and November, 1920, and March, 1921.

On one such phrase, however, there seems to be pretty general agreement, and that in spite of the fact that the meaning conventionally assigned to it can be challenged by some strong arguments for a rival interpretation. This phrase is the concluding *colon*, which expresses the author's purpose in the words *ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*. These words are usually understood as implying that Theophilus had already received instruction about Christianity and that the writer's purpose is to confirm this knowledge by supplying a full, orderly and reliable record of what had taken place. The fact that the rest of the New Testament seems to be intended without exception for Christian believers or sympathizers, and particularly the occurrence in this passage of the verb *κατηχέω*, which is used of religious instruction by Paul and almost technically in subsequent Christian literature (cf. English "catechism," "catechumen") have no doubt helped establish this view. Theophilus has been generally understood to be a Christian catechumen. Even when this has not been taken for granted it is at least supposed that he was addressed in the hope of increasing an incipient interest in Christianity.

Another interpretation of the passage, however, is quite possible—that the author is aiming to defend the Christians against unfavourable reports which had come to the ears of Theophilus. In this case the work of Luke is professedly an apologia; Theophilus is not addressed as a present or probable convert, but as a man of influence liable to entertain a hostile view towards Christianity unless by a clear statement of facts his neutrality and fairness are guaranteed.

To decide between these two interpretations of the phrase is an important task but not an easy one. Little is gained by studying the etymology of the words or their use in other writers, for all the words appear to have great breadth of

application. *Κατηχέω*, for example, is used in Hellenistic Greek of all kinds of information or instruction, while *ἐπιγινώσκω* and *ἀσφάλεια* are found in a variety of senses. It is more profitable to study carefully the meaning of these words elsewhere in Luke's writings. For Luke is an individualist in style and diction and provides the best commentary on his own usage. A characteristic of his style which is especially helpful in discovering the connotation of his words is that variation of phrase by which he so often expresses the same idea in slightly different words.[2] So it happens that although the exact expressions of the preface do not occur in full elsewhere in the two books which follow it, its meaning is distinctly illuminated by some parallels. With perhaps one exception these parallels all imply that the purpose of Luke was apologetic.

Κατηχέω, as already mentioned, means often Christian instruction, and in one passage in Acts it has perhaps this meaning. In xviii. 25, it is used of the instruction in "the way of the Lord" which Apollos had received, though "he knew only the baptism of John." In view, however, of the imperfection of the knowledge which *κατηχέω* here implies one cannot press the meaning of the verb far from its neutral sense of information received without any implication as to whether it is accurate or not. In this case Acts seems to say it was both (*see ἀκριβῶς, ἀκριβέστερον*). In the other two cases, where *κατηχέω* occurs in Acts (xxi. 21, 24), the word plainly means hostile information, and the author implies that it was also erroneous information. In both passages James is speaking of the charges of disloyalty to Moses which the Judaisers were circulating concerning Paul, and in the second he says explicitly that the information will prove unfounded. The word here is practically equi-

[2] This is best described by J. H. Ropes, "An Observation on the Style of St. Luke," *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, xii. (1901), 299 ff.

valent to *κατηγορέω*, as may be seen by the following variation of phrase characteristic of Luke:

Acts xxi. 24: *ὧν κατήχηνται περὶ σοῦ οὐδέν ἐστιν.*
Acts xxv. 11: *οὐδέν ἐστιν ὧν οὗτοι κατηγοροῦσί μου.*[3]

In the preface, therefore, if *κατηχήθης* is to be given any but the most colourless significance, we have good reason for feeling that there lurks the thought of accusation that is associated with the word by the same writer elsewhere.

A similar association of thought is found in Luke's use of *ἀσφαλές* in the book of Acts, for it is this adjective which is there his variant for *ἀσφάλειαν* of the preface. *ἡ ἀσφάλεια, τὸ ἀσφαλές, ἀσφαλές τι* seem to be used much as we say "the facts." The contrast most naturally suggested is that with an accusation or a rumour. In the article already referred to Professor Ropes says of the phrase *ἐπιγνῷς τὴν ἀσφάλειαν*:

This is often made to mean "know the certainty, or trustworthiness, of the accounts which thou hast received." So Zahn, *Einleitung in das Neue Testament*, II., p. 360, says that Theophilus is to be led to a conviction "von der Zuverlässigkeit der Reden, von welchen er Kunde bekommen hatte." But twice in Acts (xxi. 34; xxii. 30) the similar expression *γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλές* is used in the plain sense "gain sure and certain knowledge." In view of Luke's fondness for varying his phrase it seems justifiable to interpret Luke i. 4 by these later passages as meaning "that thou mightest have sure and certain knowledge concerning those matters of which thou hast heard." This suits the context better, for the mere repetition of the story by Luke would not convince of its trustworthiness, but

[3] The idiom *οὐδέν ἐστιν ὧν* occurs in the New Testament only in these two places. The next nearest parallel is Luke xxiii. 14, where we have *οὐδὲν εὗρον ὧν* employed again with *κατηγορέω* thus: *οὐδὲν εὗρον ἐν τῷ ἀνθρώπῳ τούτῳ αἴτιον ὧν κατηγορεῖτε κατ' αὐτοῦ.* Compare Acts xxv. 18, *οἱ κατήγοροι οὐδεμίαν αἰτίαν ἔφερον ὧν ἐγὼ ὑπενόουν πονηρῶν* (*v.l.* *πονηράν*).

The use of the relative with *περὶ*, as in *περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων* also finds its nearest parallels in Luke's writing in cases which bring *κατηγορέω* or similar verbs into parallelism with *κατηχέω* of the preface. (*See* Acts xxiv. 13, *περὶ ὧν νυνὶ κατηγοροῦσίν*; xxvi. 7, *περὶ ἧς ἐλπίδος ἐγκαλοῦμαι*; xxvi. 2, *περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐγκαλοῦμαι.* Compare Luke iii. 19, *ἐλεγχόμενος . . . περὶ πάντων ὧν ἐποίησεν πονηρῶν*, and even Acts i. 1, *λόγον . . . περὶ πάντων ὧν ἤρξατο Ἰήσους ποιεῖν.*

can well be said to supply full and accurate knowledge of the matters treated.

It is not only the meaning of *ἀσφαλές* that condemns the common interpretation of the clause; it is its association. In the passage in Acts most like the preface the word is followed immediately by *κατηγορέω* so that this verb again is associated with *κατηχέω*. The parallels are:

Luke i. 4: *ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.*
Acts xxii. 30: *γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλὲς, τὸ, τί κατηγορεῖται.*

Similar in thought are the two other occurrences of *ἀσφαλές* in Acts. In xxi. 34 the tribune who rescues Paul from the Jews, misinformed (*κατηχήθησαν* 21, *κατήχηνται* 24) concerning Paul and now shouting their charges against him *κράζοντες* 28, *ἐπεφώνουν* 34), cannot *γνῶναι τὸ ἀσφαλὲς διὰ τὸν θόρυβον*. In xxv. 26 *ἀσφαλές* is used of the definite information about the accused which Festus wished to secure and to send to the emperor. Thus everywhere in Luke's writings *ἀσφαλές* is used of accurate information sought in connexion with an accusation, nowhere of fuller information, or of confirmation of instruction previously received.

The same idea precisely surrounds Luke's use of the verb *ἐπιγινώσκω*. In his long discussion of the verb J. Armitage Robinson[4] gives only a passing statement of its use in the gospels and Acts, and accepting the conventional interpretation of Luke i. 4, says, "we have the word used with good effect to indicate the discernment of a particular point in regard to things already known." But the verb is used in Luke and Acts in two principal senses: (1) "to acquire knowledge." The force of the *ἐπι-* is strictly "effective" and merely that. This includes the acquiring of knowledge by an official through inquiry. (2) "To recognise." Here the "effective" force of the *ἐπι-* goes farther, so as to indicate an "active" (Robinson) knowledge of which the person is

[4] *St. Paul's Epistle to the Ephesians*, pp. 248 ff.

distinctly aware (e.g., Luke xxiv. 16, 31; Acts xii. 14; xxvii. 39; xxviii. 1). Under this head falls the use of the verb with an object clause in Luke xxiii. 7; Acts xxii. 29, "to recognise a fact in its significance," a meaning something like our word "realise."[5] In view of our previous discussion, and especially of *ἀσφαλές*, it is clear that the second meaning is most probable in Luke i. 4. The occurrences of *ἐπιγινώσκω* in Acts illustrate two characteristics of its use in the preface:

(*a*) The use in a purpose clause:

Acts xxii. 24, *ἵνα ἐπιγνῷ δι' ἣν αἰτίαν ἐπεφώνουν αὐτῷ* (tribune, cf. xxi. 34 quoted above, and his own account xxiii. 28 *βουλόμενός τε ἐπιγνῶναι τὴν αἰτίαν δι' ἣν ἐνεκάλουν αὐτῷ*).

(*b*) The use with *περί* (only here and in the preface):

Acts xxiv. 8, *δυνήσῃ αὐτὸς ἀνακρίνας περὶ πάντων τούτων ἐπιγνῶναι ὧν ἡμεῖς κατηγοροῦμεν αὐτοῦ.*

In the last quotation occurs *κατηγορέω*, the verb so constantly associated with the terms of the preface; the same thought is suggested in all the other passages of this class. (*See ἐπεφώνουν, ἐνεκάλουν* above.)

While Luke's usage of other words in the preface does not so directly bear on the purpose expressed as in the case of the words considered, yet they confirm rather than contradict the suggestion of apologetic motive. Thus *ἀκριβῶς* (*-έστερον*), although like *κατηχέω* it is used of Apollos' knowledge of "the way" (Acts xviii. 25, 26), is also used of knowledge of "the way" on the part of investigating officials (Festus, Acts xxiv. 22; Claudius Lysias, xxiii. 15, 20). *ἄνωθεν*, which expresses the author's claim of know-

[5] In these passages knowledge is acquired, but it is acquired by accident rather than intentionally through investigation. Hence they do not fall under (1). Note how in xxiii. 27 the parallel to the second passage, *μαθών* takes the place of *ἐπιγνούς*, the latter being avoided since the first meaning of the verb occurs immediately thereafter.

ledge, is also used of the knowledge about Paul held by the Jews, if they wish to be witnesses in his defence (Acts xxvi. 5). In the preceding clause ἀπ' ἀρχῆς occurs, as also in the preceding part of Luke's preface. Neither of these apparently variant expressions occurs elsewhere in Luke or Acts. καθεξῆς is used of Peter's circumstantial speech of defence to the charge of association with the uncircumcised (Acts xi. 4). Even λόγος, in spite of its varied use—note its three occurrences in Luke i. 1–4; Acts i. 1—is used by Luke in a way to justify us in interpreting λόγων as vague or uncertain if not actually hostile reports.[6]

The suggestion that Luke's expressed purpose is ἀπολογία was made two hundred years ago by C. A. Heumann in *Bibliotheca Bremensis*,[7] and no sufficient argument seems to have been brought against it. The dedication to Theophilus is no objection, for in spite of Clementine Recognitions x. 71 and later legends nothing whatever is known about him aside from the statements of the preface. His adherence to Christianity, which so many writers take for granted, is based on the conventional interpretation of κατηχήθης. He may just as well have been some Roman official who is invoked to deal fairly with the Christians. The κράτιστος applied to him is used by Luke elsewhere only in address to Roman procurators (Acts xxiii. 26, xxiv. 3, xxvi. 25) and only in connexion with court documents or speeches. In Egyptian papyri it is used of no official below the *epistrategi* who ruled over a third of the country.[8] Zahn[9] notes that

[6] E.g. λόγοις Acts xv. 24, the very sentence whose structure most resembles Luke i. 1–4. For the singular in the sense of "hearsay" note Luke vii. 17, καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ὁ λόγος οὗτος ἐν ὅλῃ . . . τῇ περιχώρῳ, where λόγος stands for ἀκοή in Mark i. 28 and for φήμη and ἦχος (remember κατηχήθης!) in parallel passages in Luke iv. 14 and 37.

[7] Class. iv., Fasc. 3 (1721), pp. 483 ff. I owe this reference to Professor G. F. Moore.

[8] Kenyon, *Textual Criticism of the N. T.*, Second Ed., p. 33. It is used also of the Prefect, the δικαιοδότης and the ἰδιολόγος, whose jurisdiction extended over the whole province.

[9] *Introduction to the New Testament*, II., pp. 42, 81 f. note 3.

the word is not used in early Christian literature of Christians. An early occurrence in an apology is the Epistle to Diognetus, i. 1.

The Greek name Theophilus does not preclude official standing under the Roman empire nor even Roman citizenship, since it is found in inscriptions in connexion with a *praenomen* and *nomen*,[10] and Luke frequently elsewhere calls Romans by their *cognomina*. In fact, for local administrators he nowhere gives a *praenomen* and only rarely the *nomen* (*Claudius* Lysias, Acts xxiii. 26; *Pontius* Pilate, Luke iii. 1, Acts iv. 27; *Porcius* Festus, Acts xxiv. 27; *Sergius* Paulus, Acts xiii. 7; elsewhere, Lysias, Pilate, Festus, and Quirinius, Felix, Gallio). Nor from what we know of ancient literary conventions was there anything incongruous in dedicating a book to an official not already in sympathy with the author's cause. Barbarian histories were dedicated to Macedonian kings[11] and Christian apologies to Roman emperors.

[10] For occurrences of the name "Theophilus" see Fabricius, *Bibliotheca Graeca*, Lib. V., cap. 1, § 20; Heumann, *loc. cit.*, supplemented by Hase, *ibid.*, pp. 505 ff. Cf. more recently Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*, *s.v.*, and add among other instances a πολιτάρχης (cf. Acts xvii. 6) in Egypt in the time of Augustus (P Oxy. 745) and an ἐπίτροπος in Lycaonia (*Bulletin de correspondance hellénique*, x. (1886), p. 502). The name is certainly Greek in origin but is used quite freely by Romans, Jews and Christians. Yet to the suggestion that Theophilus was a Roman of equestrian rank Lake (Hastings, *Dictionary of the Apostolic Church*, II. 568) considers the fact that the name is Greek and not Latin an "obvious (and, in most writers' judgment, fatal) objection," while Ramsay, who is willing to believe that Theophilus was a Roman citizen of high position feels bound to explain that Theophilus is not his Roman but his baptismal name, and is used by Luke to protect him from the odium of being recognised as a Christian (*St. Paul the Traveller and Roman Citizen*, p. 388). The theory that Theophilus is a symbolic name for the typical Christian reader, though it goes back to the time of Origen, need scarcely be refuted here.

[11] Manetho's Egyptian history, we are told, was addressed to Ptolemy Philadelphus and Berosus' Babylonian history to Antiochus I. Hellenistic writers of other kinds are said to have dedicated their works to kings, e.g. Isocrates, Archimedes, Arcesilaus, Apollonius of Perga; while Diogenes Laertius, VII. 185, notes as unusual that Chrysippus τοσαῦτα γοῦν συγγράψας

An apologetic motive for Acts has often been urged on the basis of its contents; the same theory may perhaps be applied to the gospel.[12] But even if it is not, it is quite likely that the preface belongs to the work as a whole and not merely to the πρῶτος λόγος. Other motives may have been in the author's mind,[13] but his preface is so short that he mentions only one motive, and that naturally the one most associated with Theophilus. The preface is in any case a formal composition on conventional lines and not closely associated with the text that follows it, perhaps written, as often nowadays, after the work was finished.[14]

οὐδενὶ τῶν βασιλέων προσπεφώνηκεν. (*See* J. Ruppert, *Quaestiones ad historiam dedicationis librorum pertinentes*, 1911, where dedications to Roman emperors and officials are also quoted.

[12] It would be interesting to examine in detail how far Luke's account of Jesus' trial is intended to serve as an apology. Note in comparison with the other gospels the greater distinctness of the accusation (xxiii. 2, 5), the fourfold pronouncement of innocence (xxiii. 4, 14, 15, 22) and the repeated efforts of Pilate to release Jesus (xxiii. 16, 20, 22). Both the last points are mentioned again in Acts xiii. 28 and iii. 13 respectively, in references to the trial before Pilate. It would also be interesting to consider how far the various traits in Luke's gospel generally explained as adapted to Gentile Christian readers, his emphasis on Jesus' teaching about wealth and social station, and other elements in the two volumes, fit the suggestion that a pagan official is addressed. The author's way of explaining carefully place-names in Palestine, but of mentioning without explanation such insignificant spots near Rome as Appii Forum and Tres Tabernae, his effort to connect his story with secular history, the trial of Jesus before Herod and other allusions to the Herodian house, the abrupt ending of the book of Acts, would be some of the points deserving especial consideration. But these points lie outside the immediate purpose of this article.

One must, however, constantly guard against taking the preface too seriously. It is a literary form, and the contents of the work are therefore not to be explained from the special wishes or needs of the person addressed (Wendland, *Urchristliche Literaturformen*, 3rd edition, p. 325, n. 2). Luke's work was intended for the public, not published privately; just this and not the reverse is what the dedication to an individual means (Corssen, *Göttingen Gelehrten Anzeigen* for 1899, p. 314).

[13] The Christian apologies of the second century were not solely, perhaps not principally, intended for self-defence.

[14] The preface of his Roman Antiquities was written by Dionysius of Halicarnassus after his work was finished. Quintilian, *Inst. or.* III. 9. 8 f., discusses whether the *proemium* ought to be composed last, and in Cicero's *De oratore*, II. 315 Mark Antony is made to say that this is his

Its associations in diction and style are much closer to the last chapters of Acts, which have a clear apologetic character, being intended to provide precedents for the acquittal of Christians before Roman judges. Furthermore, pains are taken to show that the matters on which Christians are accused—*ζητήματα* is Luke's word for them[15]—are quite outside of the jurisdiction of the Roman law, pertaining only to the Jewish religion.

Doubtless to the modern reader the narrative method which Luke has adopted does not seem exactly adapted to a defendant's brief. But the trial scenes in Acts show that the author felt that biographical or historical narrative was appropriate both in form and content in a speech of defence. Paul's repeated story of his conversion and call is described as an apology (xxii. 1; xxvi. 1, 2, 24), though elsewhere Luke handles it as part of the narrative. Compare also Acts x. with Acts xi. Commentators have called Stephen's speech (Acts vii.) unsuitable at a trial and irrelevant to the charges. Here and elsewhere we see the historical narrative and even the sermon serving the purpose of defence. Luke's material was partly determined for him by his sources. His first volume follows the type in which evangelic records had come down to him, and it is possible that in the second volume also he had very limited materials. Even in the speeches, though he is at liberty to compose freely, he is perhaps influenced by models or precedents. But when he had occasion, in accordance with the convention of

practice. Of course the reference there is to speeches, but the rules for writing history are the same as for speeches.

[15] Gallio: Acts xviii. 15, *ζητήματα περὶ λόγου καὶ ὀνομάτων καὶ νόμου του καθ' ὑμᾶς.*

Lysias: Acts xxiii. 29, *ζητημάτων τοῦ νόμου αὐτῶν.*

Festus: Acts xxv. 19, *ζητήματά τινα περὶ τῆς ἰδίας δεισιδαιμονίας.*

Paul to Agrippa: Acts xxvi. 3, *τῶν κατὰ Ἰουδαίους ἐθῶν τε καὶ ζητημάτων.*

In what terms Luke would describe a really relevant accusation may be seen from the context of the first three passages and by looking up in a concordance *ἀδίκημα* (*ἀδικέω*), *αἰτία* (*αἴτιον*, *αἰτίωμα*), *ἔγκλημα* (*ἐγκαλέω*).

Hellenistic literature, to select as the object of his dedication for these two books some notable individual and to state the purpose for which he had rewritten the older records in continuous narrative, he was freer. It was natural for him to hope that his work would correct any impressions adverse to the Christians that "the most excellent Theophilus" might have received, and it was characteristic of him to express this hope in the words *ἵνα ἐπιγνῷς περὶ ὧν κατηχήθης λόγων τὴν ἀσφάλειαν.*

HENRY J. CADBURY.

THE RELATION OF PHYSICAL DEATH TO SIN.

Is death in the sense of physical dissolution and decay natural to man, or is it the result of sin and as such an abnormal and unnatural phenomenon in human experience? That is the question with which this paper deals; and the answer suggested and supported is that to say that physical death is natural to man agrees neither with Scripture nor with the indications of present-day scientific thinking.

When Paul says, "Death is the wages of sin" (Rom. vi. 23), or, "Through one man sin came into the world and death came in through sin; and so death spread to all men inasmuch as all men sinned" (Rom. v. 12), the modern tendency under the influence of the supposed teaching of science is to explain that by death Paul, as indeed Scripture writers generally, meant not the purely physical or biological fact of death, but the whole fact as we sinful men know it—the physical or biological fact together with the ethical or spiritual experience of fear and dread associated with it through the disturbance of man's proper relations to God by sin, which gives to death its "sting" (1 Cor. xv. 55). The physical fact of death, it is claimed, is shown by science to be a law of organic nature, inherent in the physical organism

as such—a law which reigned in the world before man and sin appeared. To regard physical death for man as the result or consequence of sin therefore is, it is often said, scientifically unreasonable and unmeaning.

As representing this modern tendency, take, for example, the following statements of the late Principal Tulloch in his Croall Lectures entitled *The Christian Doctrine of Sin*: "To the modern mind death is a purely natural fact. It comes in course of time as the natural issue of all organism which by its very life spends itself and hastens towards dissolution as an inevitable end. . . . The physical fact of death therefore cannot be traced to sin as its sole cause. Nor can Paul be said to do this. Even when he speaks of death as the dissolution of the body, it is not only this dissolution that he means but death with all its adjuncts of pain and sadness and spiritual apprehension" (p. 163). And again: "Death as a simple physical fact is unaffected by moral conditions. Its character may be greatly altered, and no doubt has been greatly altered, by the fact of sin; but its incidence is natural and lies in the constitution of things" (p. 76).

Now that death is a law of organic nature, in the sense that every organised living creature[1] simply as a part of nature is subject to the natural law of birth and decay, may be admitted as a truth generally accepted by science. Even Weismann, while maintaining that death is not a biological necessity—"not an absolute necessity essentially inherent in life itself"—recognises its necessity from the point of view of biological "utility," "an occurrence advantageous to the species as a concession to the outward conditions of life," and in this sense part of the indispensable mechanism of nature. The position identified with such names as those

[1] The case of unicellular organisms may, for our present purpose, be overlooked.

of Dorner and Bushnell, that the principle of decay and death, even in the pre-human organic world, is due to the sin of man—death in the animal world being the "anticipative consequence" of human sin—may be regarded as scientifically absurd as well as Scripturally unsupported. Further, that the death which Scripture regards as the penalty of sin is more than mere physical dissolution and includes what is usually spoken of by way of contrast with the physical fact as "spiritual death," the desolating sense of separation from God—this also is undoubtedly true. When Scripture says that "death is the wages of sin," it means the whole fact of death as we sinful men experience it, physical and spiritual. The two component parts of man's nature, body and soul, are viewed as forming such an indivisible unity or whole that the physical fact has a spiritual significance and the spiritual a physical effect or correlative. And, indeed, it is needful to remind ourselves of what Denney points out, that it is misleading to speak of "mere physical death" for man. "There is nothing whatever in human experience which is merely physical; death is not merely physical; it is human; one awful indivisible experience which cannot be analysed, and which is profaned when it is identified with anything that could befall a lower than human nature." (*Studies in Theology*, 7th edition, p. 99.)

These two things being allowed, the question however remains, Is not the whole fact of death, the aspect of physical dissolution as well as the more spiritual side of it, for man the consequence of sin? Is not death for man, in its physical as well as in its spiritual aspect, according to Scripture, the penalty of sin? That dissolution and decay is a law of organic nature does not warrant straightway the inference that man too, as a part of nature, must be involved in physical dissolution. Were man simply a part of nature,

of organic nature, he too would no doubt be involved in the natural process of physical dissolution and death. But man is not thus simply a natural being, with nothing but the destiny awaiting him which awaits the rest of nature. He is a being invested by his very constitution with a primacy or supremacy over nature. For though connected with organic nature through his body he is endowed also with a moral and spiritual nature which raises him above nature and relates him to God in a way which makes him specifically distinct from every merely natural being. And to say that even as regards his body he falls under the same law of physical dissolution and death as the rest of organic creation is unwarrantably to beg the whole question. For it has to be asked, may not the spiritual part of man's nature have been meant in God's plan for his life to react upon and transform the physical part, so that faithfulness as a moral and spiritual agent to God's purpose would have raised even the physical side of his being above the dominance of the laws of mortality natural to the lower organic world? Is it not in accordance with Scripture indeed, and in accordance also with the scientific probabilities of the case, to say that sin has interfered with the natural sovereignty of soul over body, and that physical death, so far from being a natural normal element of human experience, is unnatural and abnormal—a result of the disorder caused by sin? On such a view there is implied in man's constitution as a moral and spiritual being not indeed the impossibility of dying (*non posse mori*) but the possibility of not dying (*posse non mori*). Had sin not entered, and the promise of his constitution been fulfilled, there might have been no severance or separation of the two parts of man's nature, body and soul, such as we now experience in death. Doubtless, as it has been said, "successive generations imply successive disappearances," but the disappearance or transition to another state of

existence might have been effected in some other way than through death. The natural body might have been changed into a spiritual body, a lower corporeity into a higher corporeity, through some more natural or normal transformation or development than the present rending asunder of soul and body, "like a northern midnight when the rose of evening becomes suddenly and silently the rose of dawn." [1] But in consequence of sin, and as a result of the disturbance of the proper relations of the spiritual and the physical, this possibility was unrealised and man became subject to the law of mortality natural to physical organisms.[2] In the language of the Apostle, the body became "dead" because of sin (Rom. viii. 10).

Such a position is already suggested by Genesis ii. 16 ff., where it is described how death was set before man as the penalty of interference with his true relation to God: "In the day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die." He ate and died in the sense that he became mortal and fell under the sway of death. Again in Genesis iii. 22 ff. we read that after his fall man was removed from Eden in order that he might not eat of the tree of life and live for ever. Which seems this early narrative's way of saying that the Creator's plan or purpose for man was that he should pass through obedience into the immortal or undying life. And the position thus already suggested in the Genesis narratives is supported by the whole Biblical view of immortality and redemption. The Bible knows nothing of an abstract immortality of the soul or of a disembodied redemption, but only of a redemption of man in his whole personality, body and soul together. It was in the body that man

[1] Quoted by Dr. Whyte in his *Shorter Catechism*, in commentary on answer to Q. 37, "What benefits do believers receive from Christ at death?" In his own recent beautiful passing, it may be remarked, we have a wonderfully fitting illustration of the words quoted.

[2] Cf. Bruce, *The Humiliation of Christ*, 5th ed., p. 259.

sinned and died. It was in the body that Christ worked out our redemption and died on the Cross. It was in the body that He rose from the dead and lives and reigns for evermore. And His risen saving working includes the vitalising and quickening of the whole person—body as well as the soul. "If the Spirit of Him who raised Jesus from the dead dwell in you, He that raised Christ Jesus from the dead shall quicken even your mortal bodies through His Spirit dwelling in you" (Rom. viii. 11). "As by man came death, by man came also resurrection from the dead" (1 Cor. xv. 21), where evidently the death referred to was no mere spiritual death inasmuch as the resurrection for which Paul was arguing was no mere spiritual resurrection. The truth underlying all this surely is, as Orr suggests, that death for man is an effect of sin. "It did not lie in the Creator's original design for man that he should die—that these two component parts of his nature, body and soul, should ever be violently disrupted and severed, as death now severs them. Death is an abnormal fact in the history of the race; and Redemption is, among other things, the undoing of this evil, and the restoration of man to his normal completeness as a personal being." (*The Christian View of God and the World*, 5th edition, p. 197.)

Had sin not entered the world, some other way than that of death there might have been of man's leaving the world and making the transition to a higher state of existence—though what this would have been we cannot definitely say. Perhaps men would have enjoyed an Enoch or Elijah-like translation. Or perhaps, like the body of the risen Lord, the bodies of all men would have undergone transformation into a more spiritual form, without passing through corruption. Such a transformation Paul points to in several passages of his letters as a possible contingency even for believers who are alive at Christ's second coming—though

ordinarily for Christians the redemption of the body involves the passing of the natural body through death and corruption in order to the soul's being clothed upon with a spiritual body. When, for example, in 1 Corinthians xv. 51, referring to Christians who are still alive at Christ's coming, Paul says, "We shall not all sleep, but we shall all be changed," he shows that he distinguished between dying and that change of the earthly body into the spiritual which must take place in order to entrance into the Kingdom of God.[1] And in 2 Corinthians v. 4 we find him expressing an intense desire that Christ may come before his own death, in order that he may thus escape being "unclothed," through the dissolution of the unity of soul and body, and the old body be transformed into or "clothed upon" by the new (lit. "be put on above" the old, ἐπενδύσασθαι) without having to pass through the trial of dissolution: "We who are in the tabernacle groan also, being burdened, in that our will is not to be unclothed, but to be clothed upon, that what is mortal may be swallowed up of life." But this contingency apart, in the case of the one man in human history who was sinless and maintained the true relation to God unbroken we have such a transformation of the natural body into the spiritual through the interpenetration of it by the spirit that the natural body was not left behind in the grave to see corruption. Mortality in His case was swallowed up of life.

If this then is the Scriptural position as to the relation of physical death to sin, is such a view not also in line with our modern scientific knowledge of the mutual relations of body and spirit and of the organic unity of the natural and spiritual worlds? Human personality, modern psychology and physiology are increasingly insisting, is a unity in which spiritual and physical are so organically connected that a

[1] Cf. A. B. Davidson, *The Theology of the Old Testament*, p. 519.

spiritual disorder involves and carries with it as its natural correlative a physical disorder. As the present writer has put it elsewhere[1]: "Sin is a fact which though primarily moral and spiritual—a matter of the will—yet extends to and includes the physical as well, moral and physical mingling with and reacting on each other till the entire resultant may be spoken of as "this body of death" (Rom. vii. 24)—"a complex whole in which it is impossible to disentangle the spiritual element from the diseased conditions and perverted functions of organ and tissue, which personal and ancestral sins have brought about" (Illingworth, *Divine Immanence*," p. 92). If this be so, then, as it has been asked, "may we not conceive, even from the scientific standpoint, a situation in which . . . (the) domination of the spiritual over the material might have demanded the transition of the individual into a higher stage of life without the occurrence of the adaptation called death?" (H. A. A. Kennedy, *St. Paul's Conceptions of the Last Things*, p. 118, *note*.)

It is this view of the relation of physical death to sin, we wish to point out in closing, that alone enables us to realise the full significance of the New Testament view of Jesus' death as expressed in such words as these: "He died for our sins," "He bore our sins in His own body on the tree." That Jesus, being what He was, should die was to Paul and the other Apostles, with their view of the relation of death to sin, a perplexing problem. For Him as sinless death was no necessity of nature. It was conditioned by His own voluntary self-surrender for redemptive ends. So Jesus Himself represented the case. "No man taketh it (My life) from Me, I lay it down of Myself. I have power to lay it down and I have power to take it again" (John x. 18). Here is a claim to unique relationship to death. He declares Himself to stand beyond the range of death's dominion;

[1] In *The Resurrection of Christ*, p. 204.

He need not die. It was a claim founded on His unique moral and spiritual character. Death is the wages or entail of sin. But He Himself knew no sin. Therefore, death had no claim on Him. "The Prince of this world cometh and hath nothing in Me" (John xiv. 30). And if the Incarnation had taken place in a sinless world, we may suppose that His earthly life would have closed and He would have passed back into a higher life without undergoing the sin-entailed experience of death. Of such a transition we have the suggestion or prefigurement already in the Transfiguration when the moral glory within transfused and transfigured the vesture of His flesh and He stood for the moment hovering between two worlds.[1] But He came into human life and experience to redeem sinful humanity, and in dying He submitted to the whole judgment of God on sin and the whole reaction of the Divine nature of things against sin—saying "Amen" to the righteousness of that order in which sin and death are indissolubly united. It was so that He represented the inner necessity or "needs-be" of His death—not the necessity of an external fate but of an inner constraint or compulsion for the realisation of Love's purposes for a sinful world. "The Son of Man must suffer many things . . . and be killed" (Mark viii. 31, Matt. xvi. 21, Luke ix. 22; cf. Luke xxiv. 7). "The Son of Man must be lifted up, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish but have eternal life" (John iii. 14, 15; cf. xii. 33). It is this connexion between the death of Jesus and the sin of the world that differentiates His death from a mere martyr death and explains the inner shrinking of His holy sensitive soul from it, the deadly fear—that, says Denney (*The Christian Doctrine of Reconciliation*, p. 273) is the meaning of *ἀγωνία* (Luke xxii. 44)—with which He free-willingly surrendered Himself to the whole length of the Divine

[1] Cf. Sparrow Simpson, *Our Lord's Resurrection*, pp. 217–218.

reaction against sin. Now if His *death* was thus necessary from the point of view of man's *sin*, it must be because of an inner connexion between the spiritual and the natural, between moral evil and physical death. As it has been put: "There must be a 'mystical union' of the natural and the spiritual in sin if this is the condition of redemption from it."[1] And what this inner connexion or union was the Scripture view of the relation of physical death to sin as set forth above enables us to realise.

Inasmuch as the death of Jesus was thus not a necessity of nature but only of grace—voluntarily submitted to for the world's redemption—His body "could not be holden of death" and was not suffered to see corruption. The body of earth was transformed into a spiritual body without having to pass through the process of disintegration and decay natural and normal to that of sinful men. In this personal triumph of Jesus over the totality of sin's consequences we have the earnest and prophecy of the ultimate redemption of man's whole personality—body as well as soul—from sin's power and the manifestation or illustration of the full significance of His own words as recorded in the Fourth Gospel: "I am the resurrection and the life . . . whosoever liveth and believeth in Me shall never die" (John xi. 25 f.).

J. M. Shaw.

ALEXANDER JOHN SCOTT.

II.

MacLeod Campbell draws a pleasant picture of his friend's life in 1841. He had gone to divide the Sunday services with him and says, "he has now a very nice little chapel. . . . His congregation is increased from what it was when I was last with him, though it is still but small. I had a

[1] *Letters of Principal James Denney to W. Robertson Nicoll*, p. 32.

very happy day altogether. . . ." [1] The little chapel at Woolwich became a kind of Bethany to many a noble and sorrowful pilgrim of the ideal. Though he continued for some years to preach to those who were willing to come and hear him, he never formed a sect. He, indeed, hated sects, and kept those whom he influenced from forming sects, though he taught them to learn from all. In his later life he belonged to no visible Church, though men of all Churches were drawn to him. Like MacLeod Campbell (when excluded from the Church of Scotland) he could only find the freedom he wanted outside ecclesiastical organisations. He maintained this position, not because he rejoiced in separation and loved isolation, but because there were principles he valued more highly than ecclesiastical fellowship. He came more and more to adopt the attitude of the early English Independents, who held that the denominational idea was an obscuration of their one great principle, and believed that the single congregation of faithful men was the best, as it was the simplest, form of Christian organisation, and that the only true union beyond it consisted in inward sympathy with and outward recognition of all other Christian congregations of whatever name, without any formal alliance with them. Scott claimed nothing and sought nothing in the way of authority or influence as a minister save through the return that might be borne to him in natural ways by the power of his message and the spirit of his work.

It was whilst at Woolwich that most of Scott's finest discourses were given—those which may be found in the volume published after his death.[2] Writing in September, 1842, Thomas Erskine says: "I spent about three months this spring and summer in London, having gone up primarily

[1] *Memorials of John MacLeod Campbell*, vol. i. p. 160. See also p. 147.
[2] *Discourses* by Alexander J. Scott. Macmillan & Co.

to hear Scott lecture on his old subject, the mutual relations of philosophy and religion. I felt an increasing value for his views on the subject, and an increasing admiration for his talents as a lecturer. I afterwards heard him deliver two lectures on Schism. He began by showing wherein true unity consists. God is the only real centre, and separation from Him the only real schism. Then our union to Him must be spiritual, and therefore schism cannot consist in a difference of form as unity cannot exist in a similarity of form. . . . I went down to Woolwich pretty often to hear him preach on Sundays, always with great satisfaction."[1]

It was during his residence in Woolwich that Scott came into close fellowship with Carlyle, Maurice, Hare, Bunsen, Jowett, John Stirling and others. A discourse on the Divine Will, reported in some magazine, deeply impressed Maurice and laid the foundation of a lasting friendship. In 1841 Scott delivered in London a course of five lectures on the Social Systems of the present day compared with Christianity. It is more than seventy years since these lectures were delivered, but reading the fragmentary reprints of them in the posthumous volume one finds little in them that is not directly applicable to present day questions and controversies.[2] The explanation of this may be found in the power which the lecturer possessed in a rare degree of seeing through phenomena to principles and of being able to discern beneath current events the things that are eternal.

"The hearing of those lectures (the lectures on Schism and those on Social Systems)," said Baldwin Brown, "formed an era in my life." Though only scraps of the lectures on both subjects were published at the time in a

[1] *Letters of Thomas Erskine*, vol. ii. pp. 26–7.
[2] *Ibid.*, vol. ii. Appendix 1.

paper called *The Pulpit*, Archdeacon Hare said of those scraps that they were in his judgment "the most important contributions to English theological literature made during this generation."

In November, 1848, Scott was elected to the chair of English language and literature in University College, London. His friend Erskine had interested himself in getting this appointment, and in a letter to Lord Rutherford he sought his lordship's influence for his "highly gifted friend Mr. Scott." "I propose this," he wrote, "because I know it would be a good service to your country and a grace to thee, as well as a living vocation to a noble character that seems almost lost at present for want of a constant and adequate object." [1]

Here is Thomas Carlyle's characteristic recommendation of him to the council of the College: "Mr. Scott has been long and intimately known to Mr. Carlyle as a man of great, solid and original powers of mind; of a pure, high and earnest character; whose rare merits the whole world, if at length the fit arena were conceded to him, might yet well come to recognise. A man of strong judgment, of deep inquiring spirit, full of delicacy and of energy and veracity, whose pilgrimage through the confusions, intellectual and other, of our time has been that of a valiant, resolute and modest man—a struggle as he supposed full of toil and painful effort and endurance, but rich also in noble victories and of lasting results to him."

In addition to his own regular work, Scott, while he resided in London, delivered here and there in England and Scotland lectures and courses of lectures on such subjects as: "The Philosophy of History," "The Existing Elements of English Society Historically Considered," "The Revival of Letters anterior to the Reformation," "The Reformation

[1] *Letters of Thomas Erskine*, vol. ii. pp. 65–6.

in its Philosophical and Social Tendencies and the Results," "The Progress of Mental Philosophy," "Poetry and Fiction," "Medieval Teachers," and to working men on: Education, and the Foundations of Society, Moral and "Economical."[1] Caroline Fox, writing in her journals of a course of lectures delivered at the Ladies' College, Bedford Square, says, "Mr. Scott's lectures are very interesting. He has an infinite fund of dry humour which people seldom take in until two minutes too late." The *Spectator* said of him that he was the profoundest of modern students of Dante. Baldwin Brown, in the letter from which I have already quoted, speaks of one of his lectures on Dante "as the most wonderful discourse I ever listened to—a great work of art and yet so natural." "I have never," wrote the late Dr. W. B. Carpenter, "heard any public speaker who could be compared with him in masterly arrangement of materials, lucid method of exposition, ready choice of the most apposite language, freedom from all redundancy, force and vigour of expression, beauty and aptness of illustration—in a word, in all those qualities which fix the attention of hearers."

Writing at the time of his death, a fine critic in the *Scotsman*, who had evidently heard him lecture often, describes the perfect freshness of impression with which all Scott's thoughts, whether on religious or any other subjects, struck his hearers. "There was an exuberance of living, instant thought, and that of the purest and highest kind, which by its very richness prevented its adequate expression. . . . It was like seeing and listening unawares to the spontaneous movements and heart-music of the soul, working out for its own delectation its own deepest themes. Instead of

[1] "Again and again the Directors of the Philosophical Institution of Edinburgh sought and obtained his highly prized services as a lecturer." *Ibid.*, vol. ii. pp. 384.

telling you of the mental experiments of yesterday, he, like a high spiritual chemist, performed them before the eyes of your mind. It was wonderful the charm this gave him over those who were willing and able to be so charmed."

When Scott was in London he delivered a series of discourses in the lecture-room of the Marylebone Literary and Scientific Institution on Sunday evenings. The first two discourses of this series, entitled "The Kingdom of Truth and the Range of Christianity," were published in pamphlet form, revised and edited by himself.[1] The two concluding paragraphs of the first sermon are interesting :—

"This declaration by the Great Teacher of the principles of His own office is put forward here, as laying the basis of that conception of the ministry by which it is desired that the weekly discourses in this place should be guided. No authority is claimed here on the ground that it has been conferred or recognised by any organised community. . . . If truth be spoken here, it has truth's authority; if divine truth, it has God's authority. Men may have additional rights to your attention, higher than this they cannot have. And what have they without this ? I, at least, if I have not this, have none.

"It is believed that not a few in this vast city, perplexed with the great speculative and social problems, may hope for a freer consideration of their difficulties from a Christian disconnected by circumstances from every existing sect. The conviction appears to spread, and the times seem destined to enforce it, that those problems rest ultimately on the right view of man's relation to God. In this place it will be maintained that our faith of this all-inclusive

[1] *Two Discourses : The Kingdom of the Truth ; The Range of Christianity*, by A. J. Scott, M.A. London, James Darling, Clerical Library ; Cambridge, Macmillan & Barclay, 1848.

relation can and ought to be applied to the solution of the same questions with which the philosopher, the economist, and the politician are engaged. Of course detail and science are not our business here but fundamental principle is. Thus there may be a significance and a suitableness in our assembling, with worship and reading of the Sacred Word, on the Christian day of convocation, in a place set apart during the week to the study of natural and intellectual laws. The perfection of the discharge of such a task would be, if by the grace of the Almighty Giver we could say, in our sphere and according to our measure : ' To this end are we here, that we should bear witness to the Truth. They that are of the Truth hear our voice.' "

In 1851, Scott was appointed the Principal of Owen's College, Manchester, and Professor of comparative grammar, of English language and literature, and of logic and mental and moral philosophy.[1] In a few years—1857—he resigned the Principalship on account of frequent illnesses which prevented him from attending as he wished to business routine, but he was desirous to hold his other chairs as long as it was compatible, in the judgment of the trustees, with the interests of the institution. He was always a delicate man, and to natural weakness was added the exhaustion of deep thinking. But for sixteen years he was able to retain his connexion with the College, and, when in good health, able with rare success to inspire the minds of his students with his own lofty enthusiasm for truth. He also took great pleasure in teaching the working men of Manchester in evening classes, similar to those he had held with the dockyard labourers of Woolwich in his earlier years. My friend, Dr. John Brown, late of Bedford, one of his few surviving pupils, writes : " It was Scott's custom, as con-

[1] As linguist Scott had command of Hebrew, Latin, Greek, French, Italian, German and was competent to teach Anglo-Saxon.

stituting the religious teaching of the college, to give once a week during term time a series of open lectures under the comprehensive title of 'The Relation of Religion to the Life of the Scholars.' These lectures, profound in style and character and delivered with marvellous extempore power, gathered audiences of the most varied kind, Manchester citizens being there as well as students, and I remember the first bishop of Manchester—James Prince Lee—himself being among them."

The information about the Manchester part of Scott's life which I have received from friends would suffice for a separate paper.[1] Let me give a sentence or two from a long letter from George Macdonald. "It was at Owen's College, Manchester, I listened to Mr. Scott expounding deep truth with an eloquence so real that my heart burned within me. I never brought a difficulty to him, metaphysical or practical, but I found the help I needed, and I should have been perplexed to decide which to wonder at the more—the clearness of his vision for the perception of a simple truth or the acuteness and accuracy of the analysis by which he conveyed his perceptions to others—had not the remarkable union of the two absorbed the wonder in itself. He seemed to me to construct bridges of metaphysical argument, bound and cemented by logic across chasms to distant heights which are first perceived only by the eye of the poet and first visited only by the faith of the prophet. And all that he said derived a new and supreme value from the accompanying conviction of the unity of his own inner life—a conviction which could not fail to be produced in the minds of all who were capable of forming the idea."

[1] Cf. especially the *Owen's College Journal* and reports, especially the account of the presentation of the bust of Scott to Owen's College, 1860. The bust, an excellent likeness, is the work of H. S. Leifchild.

A friend of many years, the late James Allanson Picton,[1] sent me this letter in 1893 :—

" My knowledge of A. J. Scott is limited to my experience of him as a lecturer and to my recollection of a very few opportunities of private intercourse. He was and will remain a puzzle. The suggestions of limitless power in his lectures seemed altogether falsified when he took to writing—which he rarely did. In 1851 or 1852 he began to give lectures at Owen's College—where he was then Principal —on ' The Relation of Religion to the Life of the Scholar.' This was an inexhaustible subject, justifying excursions throughout the universe, past, present and future, and very wonderful these excursions were. The students of the Lancashire College used to go down in a body every Thursday to hear him. When I tell you that this made return to dinner impossible, and that poor old Dr. Vaughan continually found himself, to his amazement, presiding over an empty dinner table you will feel that there is unimpeachable evidence of some strong attraction. What that attraction was it is very difficult to convey in words. Scott had no MS., unless a nearly blank sheet of quarto with perhaps three words scrawled across it in three lines can be called so. He entered, sat down at his desk and began to talk as though we had been making a morning call, and a subject of conversation had just occurred to him. By and by he would take up a pen and twiddle it ; then he would stop, and drop it as a point of some perplexity made him pause. Then he would flash out a profound suggestion that—to our young minds—seemed inspired. Then he would range through Dante, Homer, Plato, the Vedas, the Zend-a-vesta, the Koran, and so on for illustrations. Then some aberration of modern vulgarity would be remembered, and he

[1] In early years an Independent minister, latterly M.P. for Leicester, the author of several theological and philosophical books.

would throw his grand head back and his eyes would burn, and his voice would rise as near to tones of thunder as is possible in conversation. When we went away 'our hearts burned within us'—though really we could not always have told why.

"From a course on 'Natural Theology' we got more definite impressions. The somewhat platitudinarian Dr. Vaughan was giving a similar course at the same time, and why we should want to hear Scott when our own revered tutor was exhausting the same subject was to him a greater mystery by far than any theological difficulty. But while Vaughan assumed as a matter of course that the appearance of contrivance involved a contriver, and from that leaped to an infinite Contriver; Scott unfolded to us what is meant by design, e.g., the compliance, with conditions imposed, and went on to show how impossible it must be on such a basis to build belief in an unconditional Creator. There remains on me now the impression he created by contrasting the fathomless mystery involved in the mere existence of a pebble with the tricks of arrangement in eye or hand that may be imitated by finite and conditioned ingenuity. The Power that can say 'Be!' and a pebble *is*, transcends any glorified watchmaker. (I am of course only giving you the impression of a youth of twenty.)

"Scott once lectured for me at Streatham Hill Church—a very charming lecture on the 'Evidence of Things not Seen.' It was not theological, but dealt with the superior might of intangible powers as compared with what can be seen. The only thing he ever wrote that was worth reading, so far as I know, was *Acquaintance with God*, a little tract published by some religious society. When he was stung into publishing a volume of fragments after the slander in the Life of Irving, it fell dead—and deserved to do so. I have rarely, if ever, known a man with such a searching,

rousing, inspiring power over young men; but for the rest I am puzzled."

In 1865, Scott's health so completely gave way that he had to ask for leave of absence. He visited Switzerland and spent the winter on the Northern shore of the Lake of Geneva, hoping that the change and rest would recruit his strength. But it was too late; his frame was worn out, his great brain exhausted. He died the following January.

In a notice of his life which appeared in the *Spectator* after his death the writer said of him: "He was one of the few men who, with a mind thoroughly familiar with all the aspects of modern science and thoroughly saturated with philosophy, was still at bottom a Christian theologian of the highest order, with a deeper insight into the world of spiritual life than ninety-nine out of every hundred of pure theologians."

Mrs. Baldwin Brown, in a biographical sketch of her husband, wrote: "His (Baldwin Brown's) great helpfulness to the perplexed and doubting was due partly perhaps to the fact that his own faith had been firmly fixed from early years on the broad basis of a Christian philosophy expounded by A. J. Scott (for which he had been prepared by the study of Coleridge).[1] The Incarnation of the Son of God . . . was the central truth of the Gospel to him, as it was to his great teacher, of whom a deep thinker once said that his view of it 'made Unitarianism impossible.' Yet Mr. Scott was constantly stigmatised as a Unitarian." If one whole side of Christianity had not been lost sight of by the orthodox Church, I believe Unitarianism would never have existed, at least in England. As a distinct and separate system it is fast breaking up because the restoration to modern theology of hitherto neglected truths or aspects of truth is making its distinctive witness no longer necessary. Pioneers like Erskine and Campbell, Scott and Maurice, who bore

bravely isolation and misrepresentation, have shown how wide the area is in which we may live and at the same time retain and cherish our faith in the Gospel of the Son of God. These men not only had a religion; they were a religion, and the cause of it in others.

The centre and heart of Scott's religious teaching was the fact of the Incarnation. God in Christ was to him Christianity. To know Christ, he would have said, was to know God. "Jesus Christ is the one perfect witness to God; the witness to God's goodness and mercy and faithfulness . . . in contradiction to all men's distrusts, suspicions, and hard, narrow thoughts of God and His ways."

The Incarnation, reasonably and spiritually interpreted, was at the root of all his teaching—even when dealing with philosophical and social questions. "Our modern humanitarianism," he says in one of his later addresses, "is a Christian growth, though men may detach it from the trunk, and try to substitute it for the root. One great reason why they have done so is because professedly Christian teachers have been apt to divide the truth as exclusively, though on the other side. A theology that shuts out human interests has taught men a humanity that shuts out God."

The sanctity, the divineness of this life, was another of his central convictions. The essential unity of the two lives and the two worlds he held to be involved in the idea of the Incarnation. In the communion of Jesus Christ we find ourselves wedded in love and holy passion to the whole of this goodly universe. To combine time and eternity, heaven and earth, he says, is the highest test and the most difficult, and accordingly the most precious accomplishment here appointed to man. The worldly man satisfies himself with the interests and the ends of time; the mystic is stunned and absorbed by the contemplation of things

Eternal, forgetting that his work and lot is cast in time; a complete man finds heaven and eternity in earthly objects and occupations, forbidding temporal things to be mean or trivial. So in the scenery of man's actual habitation all that is most beautiful and sublime is a mingling of earth and heaven.

Scott was as few men ever were, purely and simply of the truth—one of those honest, simple, sincere souls for whom truth has a strong and irresistible affinity. That was why he knew so much of the deepest truths of life, and heard so clearly the voice of the Spirit, which may be heard by men to-day as it was heard by holy souls in past ages. He was a Christian to the core, but his Christianity was truly a wide and catholic Christianity; not a system or a plan of salvation, but a satisfaction for the deepest needs of the inner nature of man—this was also the central truth of Erskine's teaching. He saw, as all culture compels men to see, that God has never left Himself without a witness in any land or time, that there is a divine education of mankind in Greek as well as in Hebrew schools and a Divine purpose in the history of every nation.

JOHN HUNTER.

JEREMIAH AND RELIGIOUS REFORM.

IN an earlier paper it was pointed out how, when the intruded section iii. 6–18 is removed from the series of oracles which extend from iii. 1 to iv. 4 in the book of Jeremiah, there is left a coherent passage which is concerned throughout with one subject, viz., the prophet's view as to what constitutes the essence of true religion. Now, though the section must be regarded as an intrusion, and though its removal greatly improves the understanding of what remains, it does not owe its present position to chance, but to the fact that it was recognised as dealing with the same subject as the other

oracles among which it was placed. As, however, it deals with the subject from a somewhat different angle, and as it probably belongs to a later period in Jeremiah's life, the section will be found to reward independent and closer study.

Fortunately, so far as the text is concerned, the verses present little difficulty. There are occasional blunders in the Masoretic text which can, as a rule, be made good, and which, whether made good or not, do not obscure the meaning of the whole. Jeremiah accuses his fellow-countrymen in Judah of having been as disloyal to Yahweh as the Northern kingdom and of having failed to learn the right lesson from the fearful chastisement which has befallen the sister nation. It is true that Judah has not been quite indifferent to what has happened and has attempted to set her house in order, lest a like fate befal her. But what she has done has been wanting in sincerity and false in principle, and the prophet, turning from her, issues a summons to Northern Israel to do even now what Judah has failed to do. In his summons he unfolds his simple and austere view of what constitutes a thorough and true reform.

In two places the text deserves attention for clearer appreciation of its sense. Probably Ehrlich is right when he suggests that something has been lost immediately before *v.* 10. The verse states, "yet in spite of all this Judah the faithless did not return to Me." Now such a conclusion would more naturally follow some description of the penalty which had befallen Northern Israel because of its sin, rather than the description of the character of the sin which is found in *v.* 9. Again, in *v.* 12, the אֵלַי, which the Septuagint reads after שׁוּבָה, should be restored to the text; probably it once stood immediately after יִשְׂרָאֵל, and was omitted through its resemblance to the closing letters of the preceding word. Then we shall read, Return unto Me, Israel the apostate. In the same verse, finally, the unusual

phrase [1] לוֹא אַפִּיל פָּנַי בָּכֶם should probably be retained. Because it was unique and difficult of interpretation, it was glossed with the more familiar לֹא אָשׁוּר לְעוֹלָם. Remove the gloss, and the verse ends more powerfully on the final Hoseanic phrase, return unto Me, for I am merciful: oracle of Yahweh.

The advantage of restoring "unto Me" after "return" in this verse is that the complete "return unto Me" brings out more clearly how Jeremiah is using "return" here in the same sense in which he uses it throughout *vv.* 6–13, the same sense in which he uses it throughout the series of oracles among which this has been placed. He uses it with no reference to the captivity, but solely with reference to repentance toward Yahweh. He is still calling for a return which does not depend on place or circumstances, but which stands within the reach of every man who has a right knowledge of God's nature and of his own need. To have called upon the men of North Israel to return from captivity would have sounded merely stupid in the ears of the Jews, since it was perfectly well known that the poor wretches were not in captivity of their own will. But it was something of a revelation to men in Jerusalem to hear a prophet declare that their brethren, who were suffering the just penalty of their sins in captivity, could find Yahweh where they were.

The ambiguity of the word שׁוּב, however, made it possible, and the character of the people's thought about religion made it natural, to attach to this original oracle the summons to return from exile and a prophecy as to the outcome of the return which are found in *vv.* 14–18. The entire section is now generally recognised as secondary and late. How vividly the verses conflict with Jeremiah's atti-

[1] The only phrase which seems capable of illustrating it is Gen. iv. 5, where it is said of Cain נפלו פניו. A somewhat similar text in Job xxix. 24 appears to me so corrupt or dubious as to be incapable of casting light on anything.

tude in the earlier verses can be recognised at once in the verse with which the new section opens. The prophet has been commanded to tell his fellow-countrymen in Judah that they are worse than Northern Israel. The North country has suffered, because of its idolatry, the calamity of war and partial exile; and Judah has witnessed its neighbour's punishment. All these things happened for Judah's instruction, that she, learning from her sister's fate, might grow wise in time. Instead of so learning, she has proved herself worse than Israel. So much worse is she that Jeremiah does not utter a summons of repentance to her, but deliberately confines his appeal for repentance to Northern Israel, as though it alone was capable of listening to such a call. Yet immediately on this utterance the prophet is represented as saying, "Return, ye backsliding children, oracle of Yahweh, for I am a husband to you, and I will take you, one from a town, two from a family, and will bring you to Zion." It is impossible to believe that a prophet could so stultify himself as to set before the people whom he has just described as at least better than the men of Judah, how the great blessing which is to result from their return to their God is that they shall be brought to Zion. He has not even given a hint that the men in Zion have done anything which could make a prophet believe that any spiritual blessing could result from being brought to their capital. The passage is evidently an utterance from the period when it was felt to be blessedness for every loyal Jew to return to Jerusalem and join himself to the faithful remnant who were maintaining the national cause and the faith in the city. Its late date is further betrayed by the limited number of those who are expected to return. Evidently Northern Israel has already become so merged in heathenism or so content with its new surroundings that men have ceased to believe in the return of the nation as a nation. One from a town here,

two from a family there, are all who can now be expected to be sensitive to the summons of religion or desirous to share the blessings of restored Jerusalem.[1] And, as the opening verse of the section betrays the exilic outlook, so its close only more patently makes clear from what period the whole has come. For there not only Northern Israel but Judah also is regarded as in exile : and in the consummation the two exiled peoples are to be restored to their lost spiritual home.

Peake, it is true, thinks it still possible to extract *v.* 16 and regard it as a genuine utterance of Jeremiah : " When ye increase and multiply in the land in those days, men shall no more make mention of the ark of the covenant of Yahweh, it shall not occur to men's minds, nor shall it be remembered or sought after or remade." He counts the prophecy to be an utterance thoroughly worthy of the prophet and quite in his manner, and compares with it the saying about the temple in vii. 4. It is impossible, however, to repress an uneasy feeling of bewilderment as to why the desecration of the ark should be connected with the increase of the population in Palestine. Why should Jeremiah suppose that an accidental and casual circumstance such as the greater or smaller number of votaries who made use of it had any influence whatever on the value of the shrine ? Such a line of thought is not at all in his manner, since in ch. vii. he associates the value of the temple with the character, not with the number, of the worshippers. Besides *v.* 17 evidently gives the reason why the cessation of reverence for the ark is connected with an increase in the numbers of the people. For there the numbers of the faithful are to grow so large, not only through their own increase but through the accession of the heathen, that they shall need a

[1] Cf. how, in Ezek. xlviii. 19, certain persons out of the tribes of Israel not Israel as a unity, have a place in restored Jerusalem.

larger shrine. Men, in these proud days, shall cease to trouble about the absence or presence of the ark, because the sanctity which once attached to it shall be transferred to Jerusalem, which shall then become the throne of Yahweh. Again we are in the atmosphere of the post-exilic men with their anxiety about the small number of the faithful (cf. e.g. Ezekiel xxxvi. 11) and their somewhat materialistic conception of how Yahweh dwelt among His people. When Jeremiah troubles about emblems, he generally tries to substitute one which shall more worthily represent the truth it enshrines. The writer here seems content to seek to satisfy men who had lost the old emblems of their faith, such as the ark was, by giving them new emblems which meant the same thing. The whole section, *vv.* 14–18, is too closely woven together in its thought to be broken up, and it is too different from the Jeremianic oracle which precedes it to be retained.

After having removed the accretions, it becomes possible to take the genuine verses by themselves and see what they imply. The first thing which becomes patent, so soon as one refuses to be influenced by the interpretation which the later verses have placed upon the oracle, is that Jeremiah is neither speaking nor thinking about a return from exile at all. He is speaking only of a repentance which is independent of all locality. His two magnitudes, as is most clear in his closing sentences, are, as before, Yahweh who is merciful, and the soul, which is repentant. Nothing else comes within his view. Let Northern Israel, wherever it may be, whether still in its own land or scattered in exile, return to Yahweh, acknowledging its sins against Him and especially its faithlessness in its false worship, and it shall find Him, for He is merciful.

At first sight it might appear as though the prophet were merely restating his conviction as to what constitutes the

essence of true religion, which has already appeared in the rest of the chapter. But this is not the case, for each statement has its own background. In his earlier oracles he states his view against the half-heathen worship which was prevalent among his countrymen : here he states it against some new action on the part of Judah. It is true that the false worship both of Israel and Judah appears here also. To it he ascribes the calamities which have befallen Samaria, and which might also have befallen Judah. What constitutes the *peculiar* guilt of Judah is not the sin which it has in common with its neighbour, but that it has drawn the wrong lesson from the calamity which has befallen its partner in a common guilt. Judah did lay the calamity to heart, it repented but not with its whole heart, and falsely. It is over against this false repentance on the part of his fellow-countrymen that the prophet now posits his view of true religion in the form of a summons to the suffering North. There is no need to suppose that Jeremiah either desired or expected that this message should be carried abroad. He is using the form of an address to Samaria as a means of bringing vividly before the men of Jerusalem how the men they count lost to God's mercy are more accessible than they, and how simple and austere are the things necessary for a religious reformation.

Now it seems unlikely that, when the prophet pressed on the attention of his countrymen the meaning of the tragic events which had attended the collapse of their neighbour state, he was saying anything which was particularly novel or which other thoughtful men had not already been laying to heart. One may readily suppose that this was one of the chief motives which had urged on priest and prophet in the capital the need for a far-reaching religious reformation.[1] God had showed fearful things in their immediate

[1] Because this is so likely a supposition, it seems an unwise step to cut

neighbourhood, and He had showed them in order that wise and devout men might lay them to heart. In fact, Jeremiah makes it perfectly clear that the matter had been laid gravely to heart. He does not accuse Judah of having been utterly deaf and blind to God's action. Instead he says that Judah did repent, only the nation repented, not with the whole heart, but falsely. He is evidently recognising that Judah has made a real change, which was meant by those who led it and practised it as a sincere effort at repentance and reformation. He could not have spoken in the way he does, unless there had been something which he could characterise as a false reformation. Judah, as a nation, has changed her ways, for the terms in which the prophet speaks of the matter show that it involves no mere sporadic reformation which concerns merely a few. Even as Northern Israel had sinned as a people and suffered as a people, even as the nation Judah had sinned like its neighbour, so it has now repented as a nation. The inevitable conclusion to which such a description of the situation points is that the prophet is referring to the reform carried out under Josiah.

Here it is noteworthy that the oracle is dated : "Yahweh spoke to me in the days of Josiah the king." The other oracles among which it has found its place are undated. In certain respects it may be said that they need no date, for they are timeless in their character. Being great positive utterances, except in so far as they attack the false religion on the high places, they might belong to any period in the prophet's life. Yet there are two clear hints which point to

out all the descriptions of exile, which occur in Deuteronomy and the allied literature, as *ipso facto* post-exilic in date. Some of these may well have been taken from the actual events men had witnessed or heard of ; in the pitiful and tragic fate of the country which lay so near their door. And wise men may well have used these in order to rouse the consciences of their countrymen.

their having been composed and uttered in the early period of Jeremiah's career. Thus the fact that they include so vehement an attack on the high places and the worship there and that these places of worship are so numerous as to be visible on every height to which men may lift up their eyes seems to imply that they were spoken before these very high places were swept away by the reformers of Josiah's reign. And again the thought and imagery of these oracles are so saturated in the thought and imagery of Hosea that they naturally suggest to a reader the figure of a younger man who has not developed his own manner but is still following in the footsteps of a revered master.

Jeremiah has stated in his youth what seem to him the few essentials of true repentance, and has developed the contrast between these and the actual worship practised by his people. He has given voice to the sick disgust which every true Jew felt at the sight of this popular religion, and the revolt at the thought that this should represent the soul of his nation in its prayers. He knew himself to be saying then what every devout Jew must recognise. And he had not been wrong. Other men had felt what the prophet uttered. He was right in his belief that he did not stand alone in his confidence of these things being unfit to satisfy the soul of Judah. Some of these, awake to the evils, seeing to what they must lead and seeking their own way of reforming them, have framed their programme of reform and are seeking to put it into force. Now the prophet must make up his mind whether his fundamental principles find their full expression in this effort. Can he see, in the work of these men, the essential things in which he believes coming to complete recognition ? Can he support, or must he differ from, the men who, like him, are all out for reformation ? And, if he is compelled to differ, he is equally compelled to give his reasons.

There can be no question as to his differing: the only question is as to its extent. Are we then to suppose that he only differs from his brother reformers in the way in which a prophet is always apt to differ from the practical ways of a programme? In this case, what we have is a common experience in all religious history, the individualist over against the committee, the mystic judging the compromises of the practical man. The mystic and saint are always liable to remain cold over improvements which are concerned with the machinery of religion and to insist on the need for a fresh spirit which is to actuate the whole machine. And, it may be added, every religious communion is in poor case, unless it rears both types and can find room and use for both.

It would, then, be possible to recognise in Jeremiah's attitude towards the reformers of his own time no more than another illustration of the wholesome interaction of two perennial types of mind, had he been content to say that Judah the faithless had failed to repent with her whole heart. But he goes further and says two things more. He says that she has repented falsely. The phrase might be regarded as no more than a stronger expression for a repentance which was not carried out with the whole heart, were it not that the verdict on the reform appears in a much more pointed form at viii. 8: "How can ye say, We are wise and have the torah of Yahweh? Behold, the false pen of the scribes hath made of it a lie?" Such a verdict can only imply that the reform which Jeremiah has witnessed has not failed because the people have failed to carry out fully what their religious leaders demanded, but has failed because these religious leaders have turned it into a false direction. The fault is not in the reformed, but in the reformers, in the false pen of the scribe.

How grave this wrong direction given to the movement

was, and how deep and far-reaching were its effects, Jeremiah shows in the second thing he says. For he turns deliberately away from Judah after its reformation has been carried out, and repeats his own original view of what constitutes the essentials of a right repentance to Northern Israel. Evidently he means that the reform Judah has carried out has only had as its result to close the people's eyes to the simplicity and the austerity of true religion. So sure is this result of the reform that there is now more hope of poor unreformed North Israel than for it. He does not state, it is true, what are the elements in his people's reform to which he takes such grave exception. But the fact that he repeats what, to his mind, are the essential and sufficient conditions of every reform seems to show clearly that the reform which he has witnessed has either failed to include or has succeeded in obscuring the very things without which no reform can be true.

I stated, in an earlier paper, how Jeremiah's view of what constitutes religion inevitably made him sit light to certain elements that were peculiarly Jewish in his people's faith, and that he might find himself in difficulties with other reformers of his own time. The section, here presented, seems to furnish the proof of the fact. The prophet does not state specifically what it is against which he reacts. It is possible that he had not thought out clearly what his own position implied. It is also possible that he had not thought out fully all the implications of the reform of his own time. With the instinct which is inherent in every great religious force, and belongs to every strong religious personality, he may simply have felt the peril which lay here for things which, as he believed, constituted the very essence of religion. He then reacted, as religion has always reacted, against what threatened its deepest convictions.

ADAM C. WELCH.

INDEX.

PAGE

Rev. Professor H. T. Andrews, D.D.

The Origin of Christianity in the Light of Modern Criticism 401

Rev. Professor W. Emery Barnes, D.D.

Psalm lxii. 120
Psalm cxxxix.: The Wanderer's Psalm 329

Rev. W. Ernest Beet, M.A., Litt.D.

The Number of the Beast 18

Professor Vacher Burch.

Factors in the Christology of the Letter to the Hebrews 68
The Austerities of Discipleship to Jesus Christ . . 196
The Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface . . . 431

Rev. Canon Anthony C. Deane, M.A.

"Not into Temptation" 424

Rev. Alfred Fawkes, M.A.

A Great Scottish Preacher 189

Rev. Professor G. Buchanan Gray, D.D.

Cain's Sacrifice: a New Theory 161

Professor Rendel Harris, Litt.D., LL.D.

The Apology of Quadratus 147
The Odes of Solomon and the Biblical Targums . . 271

The Late Rev. John Hunter, D.D.

Baldwin Brown 301
Alexander John Scott I. 386
II. 450

Rev. Maurice Jones, D.D.

The Hellenistic World Behind the New Testament . . 338

Rev. Professor H. A. Kent, M.A., D.D.

The Forgiveness of Sins in the Old Testament . . 365

Rev. Professor Ed. König, D.D.

The Burning Problem of the Hour in Old Testament Religious History 81

PAGE

Rev. J. H. Leckie, D.D.
John MacLeod Campbell : the Development of his Thought I. 54
II. 107

Rev. Professor John E. McFadyen, D.D.
An Old Testament Message 1

Rev. Professor A. M. Pope, D.D.
The Genesis of the Roman Epistle. 359

Rev. Professor A. T. Robertson, D.D., LL.D., Litt.D.
The Greek Article and the Deity of Christ . . . 182

Rev. Professor T. H. Robinson, M.A., D.D.
The Ecstatic Element in Old Testament Prophecy . 217

Rev. Professor J. M. Shaw, M.A.
The Relation of Physical Death to Sin 441

Rev. Edward Shillito, M.A.
The Sequel to Job 417

Rev. J. F. Springer, D.D.
The Marcan Ἐπιράπτει 79

The Late Rev. Professor Benjamin B. Warfield, D.D.
Jesus Christ the Propitiation for the Whole World . 241

Rev. Professor Adam C. Welch, D.D., D.Theol.
The Call and the Commission of Jeremiah . . . 129
Jeremiah and the Essence of Religion 254
Jeremiah and Religious Reform 462

Rev. Walter R. Whately, M.A.
"See Thou Tell No Man" 40

Rev. G. H. Whitaker, M.A.
"Love Springs No Leak" 126
Additional Note on "The Philology of St. Luke's Preface" 239

Rev. Newport J. D. White, D.D.
The Catholic Church and the Summing up of All Things in Christ 204

Rev. E. W. Winstanley, D.D.
Jesus and Baptism : the Evidence of the Fourth Gospel 321

Rev. W. Spicer Wood, M.A.
Fellowship 31
The Ministry of Women and St. Paul 292

INDEX TO SUBJECTS.

PAGE

Additional Note on "The Philology of St. Luke's Preface" . 239
Apology of Quadratus, The . . 147
Austerities of Discipleship to Jesus Christ, The 196
Baptism, Jesus and: The Evidence of the Fourth Gospel . 321
Biblical Targums, The Odes of Solomon and the 271
Brown, Baldwin 301
Burning Problem of the Hour in Old Testament Religious History, The 81
Cain's Sacrifice: a new Theory 161
Call and the Commission of Jeremiah, The 129
Campbell, John MacLeod: the Development of his Thought 54, 107
Catholic Church and the Summing up of All Things in Christ, The 204
Deity of Christ, The Greek Article and the 182
Discipleship to Jesus Christ, The Austerities of 196
Ecstatic Element in Old Testament Prophecy, The . . . 217
Επιράπτει, The Marcan . . . 79
Factors in the Christology of the Letter to the Hebrews . . . 68
Fellowship 31
Forgiveness of Sins in the Old Testament, The 365
Genesis of the Roman Epistle, The 359
Greek Article and the Deity of Christ, The 182
Hebrews, Factors in the Christology of the Letter to . . . 68
Hellenistic World behind the New Testament, The 338
Jeremiah, The Call and the Commission of 129
Jeremiah and Religious Reform 462
Jeremiah and the Essence of Religion 254
Jesus and Baptism: The Evidence of the Fourth Gospel . 321
Jesus Christ the Propitiation for the Whole World 241

PAGE

Job, The Sequel to 417
"Love Springs No Leak" . . . 126
Luke's Preface, The Purpose Expressed in 431
Marcan Επιράπτει, The 79
Ministry of Women and St. Paul, The 292
Modern Criticism and the Origin of Christianity 401
New Testament, The Hellenistic World behind the 338
"Not into Temptation" . . . 424
Number of the Beast, The . . . 18
Odes of Solomon and the Biblical Targums, The 271
Old Testament, The Forgiveness of Sins in the 365
Old Testament History, The Burning Problem of the Hour in . 81
Old Testament Message, An . . 1
Old Testament Prophecy, The Ecstatic Element in 217
Origin of Christianity in the Light of Modern Criticism, The . . 401
Philology of St. Luke's Preface, Additional Note on 239
Psalm lxii. 120
Psalm cxxxix. 329
Purpose Expressed in Luke's Preface, The 431
Quadratus, The Apology of . . 147
Relation of Physical Death to Sin, The 441
Roman Epistle, The Genesis of the 359
St. Luke's Preface, Additional Note on the Philology of . . 239
St. Paul, Ministry of Women and 292
Scott, Alexander John . 386, 450
Scottish Preacher, A Great . . 189
"See Thou Tell No Man" . . 40
Sequel to Job, The 417
Solomon, The Odes of, and the Biblical Targums 271
Targums, The Odes of Solomon and the Biblical 271
Wanderer's Psalm, The . . . 329
Women, The Ministry of, and St. Paul 292

INDEX TO TEXTS.

	PAGE
Gen. iii. 16	297
xii. 1	102
Exod. xx. 23	371
xxii. 29, 30	372
xxiii. 12	372
xxiii. 15	371
xxiii. 17, 18, 19	371
Num. xi. 12	283
Deut. xxv. 4	298
Josh. xxiv. 2 f.	103
Nehem. iv. 2	123
iv. 20.	123
Ps. i. 8	383
ii. 3	383
viii. 13	383
xviii. 20	330
xviii. 25	330
xxi. 4	284, 287
xxi. 5	284
xxi. 8	287
xxii.	380
xxvii. 1	287
xlvi. 1 f.	288
l. 22	290
li.	380
lxii. 1	120, 121
lxii. 2	121
lxii. 3	122
lxii. 4	123
lxii. 5–9	123
lxii. 10, 11	124
lxii. 12	125
cxii. 5	122
cxxxix. 1	330
cxxxix. 2–6	331
cxxxix. 7–12	333
cxxxix. 13–18	334
cxxxix. 19–22	335
cxxxix. 23, 24	336
Prov. viii. 17	285
Isaiah i. 12	288
xlii. 6	132
Isaiah xlix. 5	132
Jerem. ii. 28	101
iv. 23–26	230–231
viii. 8	471
viii. 22	368
ii. 16	100
Hos. iv. 11	5
Amos. ii. 11 f.	8
ii. 12	4
iii. 2	11
iv. 1	3
iv. 6–12	13
iv. 10	11
iv. 12	1
v. 4	15
v. 14	15, 17
v. 15	16
v. 19	12
vi. 14	11
vii. 12 f.	8
viii. 5	7
viii. 8	10
ix. 7	12
Matt. xvi. 21	449
Mark i. 43, 44.	44
i. 45	46
viii. 31	449
xvi. 15	210
Luke i. 4	435
vii. 17	437
ix. 22	449
xiii. 23	49
xxiv. 7	449
John i. 29	243
iii. 14, 15	449
iii. 16	243
x. 18	448
xi. 25	450
xii. 32	211
xiv. 30	449
xv. 8	240
Acts ii. 42	31
Acts xxi. 24	434
xxii. 24	436
xxii. 30	435
xxiv. 8	436
xxv. 11	436
Rom. iv. 20, 21	240
v. 12	441
vi. 23	441
vii. 24	448
viii. 11	446
xii. 13	33
xv. 25, 26	33
xv. 27	33
1 Cor. i. 9	34
x. 16	36
xi. 45	294
xi. 29	34
xii. 27	209
xiv. 34	292, 296
xv. 21	446
xv. 51	447
xvi. 23	35
2 Cor. v. 4	447
v. 19	207
viii. 4	33
ix. 13	33
Gal. vi. 6	33
Eph. i. 23	210
iv. 12, 13	210
v. 22, 23	297
Phil. i. 5	33
ii. 1	35
iii. 10	35
iv. 13	128
iv. 15	34
Col. i. 17	206
i. 19, 20	207
1 Tim. ii. 8–12	293
vi. 17	33
Heb. xiii. 16	33
1 John ii. 2	241

Printed in Great Britain by Butler & Tanner, Frome and London

3 2400 00276 5760

DATE DUE

FEB 0 6 2000

FEB 1 4 2000

GAYLORD

PRINTED IN U.S.A.

Ser 8
v.21
1921:1
Expositor